



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 154

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2008

No. 25

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

Monsignor Richard W. O'Keeffe, Immaculate Conception Church, Yuma, Arizona offered the following prayer:

Ditāt Deus, God Enriches. Those magnificent words are found on the seal of the State of Arizona as we celebrate today our 96th birthday as entering into the States of the United States. And so this morning we thank God for all those enriched graces that He has given to each and every one of us.

As we pray here this morning, we ask the Lord of all our endeavors to give our elected Congress men and women the courage to follow noble aspirations, strength to support worthy causes, integrity to seek the truth, and in all of their legislative duties, be their inspiration and guide.

Lord, You remember forever Your covenant with us. Even though it was centuries ago that You formed a community of family life with us, still You remain continually faithful. Enable us by Your merciful help to keep faith with You, to renew our covenant at important or difficult moments of our life so that at the end we may receive the promise of the covenant.

Lord, to those who believe in You, You promise kindness and truth, justice and peace. When we are faced with difficulties, increase our faith, but do not lower our ideals. From the least likely places You can bring forth the triumph of Your grace. These things we ask in Your name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PALLONE). The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BLUMENAUER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING MONSIGNOR RICHARD O'KEEFFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is my pleasure to welcome Monsignor O'Keeffe as our guest chaplain today.

Monsignor O'Keeffe has been tending to the spiritual and human needs of people in Arizona for over 40 years, of which the last 30 has been in Yuma, Arizona. It is fitting that he provides today's blessing, as we also memorialize the passing of Congressman Lantos, a great champion of human rights.

Monsignor O'Keeffe is highly respected in Yuma and all of Arizona for the work he does on behalf of human rights, civil rights and advocating for the underrepresented in our community.

He is an active member of the community, encouraging community leaders to take responsibility for social justice, recruiting young and old to engage in civic participation. His experience and passion has led him to be a founder of the Yuma Interfaith Organizing Committee.

I am honored to work with him and receive spiritual and community guidance from him. He is a source of strength for all of us who interact with him.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome my friend Monsignor O'Keeffe to the House of Representatives.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 10 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

GO TIGERS, GO

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I know today we're going to talk a lot about FISA, but before we do I want to rise to commend the University of Memphis men's basketball team on an outstanding season. So far the Tigers have amassed 24 wins, no losses, earning them the top national ranking in college basketball.

Thanks to the enthusiastic support of the Memphis Tiger fans, and especially the "Blue Crew," the Tigers hold the Nation's longest home court winning streak, 47 wins in a row.

ESPN has called them and their coach, John Calipari, relentless and unselfish.

I applaud the Tiger basketball team for setting an example of teamwork and tenacity that all teams, individuals and even this Congress would do well to follow.

On behalf of the people of the great City of Memphis and the great State of Tennessee, I congratulate the Tigers, and I wish them luck on the remainder of the season.

Thank you for making us proud.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H945

PRESIDENT BUSH'S BUDGET TARGETS PUBLIC BROADCASTING AGAIN

(Mr. BLUMENAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Well, it's a new year and again the Bush budget targets public broadcasting. Year after year, they've attempted to chop away at that investment. Year after year Congress rejects it.

This year it is a \$420 million reduction, including \$200 million that's already been allocated for this year. This assault on public broadcasting is not just undermining the digital conversion, the education and public affairs that we have grown to rely on, it's a direct assault at small-town and rural America where it's more expensive to reach and they don't have the donor base to provide it for themselves.

The irony is that San Francisco, New York, Washington and, dare I say, Portland, Oregon will always have public broadcasting. But if this Bush budget is adopted, it's going to decimate public broadcasting in rural and small-town America.

Please join the over 110 members of the bipartisan Public Broadcasting Caucus to again reject this assault on public broadcasting.

PROTECT AMERICA ACT

(Ms. GRANGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, once again the Protect America Act is set to expire. If the bipartisan Senate FISA bill is not passed in time, our intelligence agency will be blinded to our enemies' plans and required to consult a lawyer before eavesdropping on foreign terrorists.

The House should immediately pass the Senate's bipartisan bill which passed the Senate by a 68-29 vote. Our intelligence community needs a long-term fix in our intelligence laws, not a month-to-month extension.

More importantly, the Senate FISA bill grants liability protection to telecommunications companies that helped the government after September 11. Allowing these companies to be subjected to frivolous lawsuits threatens their cooperation in the future. This could have a crippling effect on America's counterterrorism efforts.

Yesterday, the Democrat majority chose partisan politics in the face of a strong bipartisan solution that directly determines the fate of our intelligence gathering abilities, and the House Democrat leadership failed. The American people have asked for solutions, not political grandstanding.

We should take up the bipartisan Senate FISA bill immediately. This cannot wait until we return from the President's Day recess.

GUN VIOLENCE

(Mr. RUSH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor to speak on what I call "The Daily 45."

The Department of Justice reports that on average, every day here in America, 45 people are shot and killed in a fit of revenge, robbery or troubled relationships. These are more than our soldiers who are killed in Iraq and Afghanistan each and every day.

Today I reflect on a story that has captured the hearts and the minds of Chicago area residents. On Saturday, February 2, the day began like any other day for six unsuspecting women. Five of these women, customers and workers at a Lane Bryant clothing store in the southwest suburbs of Chicago, were heartlessly murdered during an apparent midday botched robbery attempt by an assailant wielding a gun.

37-year-old Connie Woolfolk, 42-year-old Rhoda McFarland, 22-year-old Sarah Szafranski, 33-year-old Carrie Hudek Chiuso, and 34-year-old Jennifer Bishop should not be forgotten. Neither should we forget the sixth woman who was shot in the neck, but survived.

When will America say, "Enough is enough"? Stop the killings.

FISA

(Mr. HOEKSTRA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, what is it that my friends on the other side don't understand about the threat that faces our country today? Have they not seen the reports coming from Iraq where al Qaeda in Iraq has now stated that their objective is to use Iraq to launch attacks against Jerusalem and Israel? Have they not read the reports today about a radical Islamist plot to perhaps assassinate the President of the Philippines? Have they not read about the attacks or the arrests in Denmark of radical Islamists perhaps planning an attack in Denmark?

What is it that you don't understand about the nature of the threat, that this is a global threat that wants to defeat us in Iraq, that wants to destabilize modern Islamic regimes, wants to eliminate the State of Israel, establish the caliphate and reach for the brass ring, which is to attack the United States? Why are you unwilling to put the Senate FISA bill on the floor and give the intelligence community the tools that they need to keep America safe?

HEALTHY HOSPITALS ACT

(Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, here's today's grisly toll.

235,626 cases, 11,661 deaths, and a cost of \$5.89 billion. What I'm talking about here are the number of people who obtain and die and the overall cost of infections in our hospitals every year, from MRSA, from pneumonia and other infections. It is time that Congress got serious about this.

In the last 3 years since I've first introduced this bill, 90,000 people have died each year from infections they pick up at hospitals. It is time we pass the Healthy Hospitals Act, H.R. 1174, and work to make sure our hospitals are safer.

THE LAWLESSNESS SOUTH OF THE BORDER

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, Americans are under vicious attack in Mexico. The new threat comes from south of the border in the form of organized and violent Mexican kidnappers.

Last year, 26 San Diego, California residents were kidnapped and held for ransom while traveling to Mexico. Numerous Mexican nationals also were kidnapped. Some victims were murdered. Only a few of the people kidnapped were ever rescued. They reported that they were beaten, tortured and sexually assaulted.

The FBI says that these sophisticated kidnappers are growing in number. The State Department has even issued a travel alert for U.S. citizens living and traveling in Mexico. This new form of terrorism is very disturbing.

While President Calderon is here in the United States lobbying for illegal immigrants to get amnesty, Mexican and U.S. citizens are being victimized in his home country. President Calderon would do well to stay home in lawless Mexico, get his house in order and protect the rights of hundreds of his own people and the U.S. citizens who are being abducted and held for ransom by these outlaws.

And that's just the way it is.

□ 1015

IMPERATIVE FISA RENEWAL

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the bipartisan Protect America Act, a critical anti-terrorist law that closes loopholes in our intelligence laws and protects civil liberties is, once again, about to expire. The House must act today on this critical piece of legislation, which passed the Senate by 68-29. If this Senate bill is not passed in time, our intelligence agencies will be blinded to our enemies' plans and required to consult a lawyer before eavesdropping on foreign terrorists.

Democrats have had more than 6 months to make the Protect America

Act permanent and provide immunity to telecommunications firms that assisted our government and performed their patriotic duty after 9/11. The time for indecision and second-guessing is over. The time to get this important legislation passed into law is today.

House Democrats should pass the Senate bill and get it to the President, again, today.

THE NEED FOR A PERMANENT FISA BILL

(Mr. KLINE of Minnesota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, al Qaeda and their terrorist allies are America's number one enemy. We all know that. They are constantly updating the way they communicate and dodge our intelligence networks. We should be doing nothing short of providing our intelligence officials with every tool necessary to always stay a step ahead of these radical extremists.

Admiral Mike McConnell, the Director of National Intelligence, when asked about the Protect America Act, said this, "We must be able to continue effectively obtaining the information gained through this law if we are to stay ahead of terrorists who are determined to attack the United States."

House Republicans have led the way in delivering 21st century intelligence collection to protect our citizens. The law now gives enforcement the tools and flexibility needed to quickly respond to terrorist threats because House Republicans acted to close a dangerous loophole in an outdated intelligence law. But the law is threatened today by the House Democrat majority who are more interested in getting it for partisan reasons than to provide this country and our allies abroad the protection necessary as we continue to fight terrorism.

A short-term extension is not enough. We need a permanent fix now.

APPOINTMENT OF HON. STENY H. HOYER AND HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN EN- ROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESO- LUTIONS THROUGH FEBRUARY 25, 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 14, 2008.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STENY H. HOYER and the Honorable CHRIS VAN HOLLEN to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through February 25, 2008.

NANCY PELOSI,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the appointment is approved.

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 18 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1105

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER) at 11 o'clock and 5 minutes a.m.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 2, nays 390, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 58]

YEAS—2

Barton (TX)

Johnson (IL)

NAYS—390

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Bean
Becerra
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)

Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley

Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Cardoza
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner

Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)

Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Lofgren, Zoe
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCauley (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Muschgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)

Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Skelton
Sklauger
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberti
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weiler
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—36

Ackerman
Berkley
Brown, Corrine
Cardoza
Davis (IL)
Dingell

Doyle
Engel
Garrett (NJ)
Mahoney (FL)
Markey
Moore (KS)

Jones (OH)
Lowey
Lucas
Mahoney (FL)
Markey
Moore (KS)

Moran (VA)	Ryan (OH)	Towns
Pence	Sestak	Watson
Peterson (PA)	Shays	Wilson (NM)
Rangel	Shimkus	Wittman (VA)
Renzi	Simpson	Wynn
Rohrabacher	Solis	
Ruppersberger	Tierney	

□ 1157

Messrs. RAHALL, MILLER of Florida, OBERSTAR, and FRANK of Massachusetts changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. SESTAK. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 58, I was with my six-year-old daughter, Alex, at the hospital. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Ms. SOLIS. Madam Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 58 on the motion to adjourn, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5270. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 5 of title I of division H of Public Law 110-161, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senator as Chairman of the U.S.-Japan Interparliamentary Group conference for the One Hundred Tenth Congress:

The Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS).

PROVIDING FOR ADOPTION OF H. RES. 979, RECOMMENDING THAT HARRIET MIERS AND JOSHUA BOLTEN BE FOUND IN CONTEMPT OF CONGRESS, AND ADOPTION OF H. RES. 980, AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO INITIATE OR INTERVENE IN JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS TO ENFORCE CERTAIN SUBPOENAS

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 982 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That House Resolution 979 and House Resolution 980 are hereby adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H. Res. 982 provides that upon its adoption, House Resolution 979 and House Resolution 980 are hereby adopted.

House Resolution 979 recommends that the House of Representatives find Harriet Miers and Joshua Bolten, the White House Chief of Staff, in contempt of Congress for refusal to comply with subpoenas duly issued by the Judiciary Committee.

□ 1200

House Resolution 980 authorizes the Judiciary Committee to initiate or to intervene in any judicial proceedings to enforce certain subpoenas.

Madam Speaker, I've had so many requests for time that I will cut my own time short. I simply want to give some reasons why it's important that we're here today.

In my 21 years in the House, I have known that there were Members who came to Congress simply hoping that throughout their career they will always land on the safe square; not wanting to take a vote that might challenge them in any way, not wanting to take a vote that might require explanation. Fortunately, this is the safe square today.

What we are doing here today is protecting the Constitution of the United States of America, which all of us are pleased, when we come here, to raise our hand and swear so to do. It is critically important that we protect the powers of the Congress of the United States for future generations. It would be dreadful if a future President, having looked back over the recent events, used it as a precedent.

We have a strong case on the merits, is the first point I want to make. The administration's assertions of executive privilege are weak, excessively broad, and unprecedented. We win the executive privilege argument both on legal grounds and our compelling need for requested information.

Aside from prevailing on the merits of the executive privilege dispute, enforcing our subpoenas is part and parcel of our current ability to perform effective oversight. If we accept the White House stonewalling in this instance, the House, in the future, will not be able to conduct its oversight. And every future President can view Congress, not as a coequal branch of this government, but as subordinate to the executive.

The enforcement of the subpoenas in this investigation seeks to strengthen,

rather than weaken, the House's prerogatives by demonstrating that we are serious about citizens resisting the issuance of validly authorized congressional subpoenas. If we countenance a process where subpoenas can be readily ignored, where a witness, under a duly authorized subpoena, doesn't even bother to appear, where privilege can be asserted on the thinnest of reeds and the broadest possible manner, then we have already lost, and we may be in much more danger than even we believe.

There's ample precedent supporting the House's prerogative to initiate a civil action. If we pursue this course of action and it proves to be legally incorrect, then we here in Congress, where the laws are passed, can take necessary steps to correct that procedure. If we do not pursue this course of action at all, we, again, have already lost.

There are some who believe that the court will say that indeed we have no rights here. If that is the case, if that even should be a possibility, then I think we have to say that if the Justice Department has become that politicized and that weak, then we are in worse shape in this democracy than we know.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlelady from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) for the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I was in the funeral of our distinguished friend and colleague, Congressman Lantos, someone whom I admired very, very much and who was a personal friend. I was standing by the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

At the time during the funeral, the House was in recess subject to the call of the Chair under the understanding that we would not come back into session until after the funeral. And I was most disturbed and hurt and pained when, even though the funeral was still proceeding and distinguished guests were speaking, the bells rang that the House was going back into session and I had to leave.

Because of my obligation today, I have the assignment, as a member of the Rules Committee, to be here during this rule. I had to leave the funeral to be here today. It's most unfortunate, and I'm very, very sorry that the day has begun in that ultimately unfortunate fashion.

Madam Speaker, today the majority proposes that the House consider a rule that, according to the Parliamentarian, is unprecedented in the history of this institution. It will prevent any and all debate on two contempt motions against former White House Counsel Harriet Miers and White House Chief of Staff Josh Bolten.

A contempt resolution is a privileged matter because it directly concerns the constitutional rights and privileges of

the House. Chapter 17, section 2 of House Practice states, "Such a resolution may be offered from the floor as privileged, because the privileges of the House are involved."

The action of the majority today is most unfortunate. Never before in the history of this House has a contempt resolution, one of the highest questions regarding the rights and privileges of this institution, been treated in such an underhanded manner. If this rule is adopted, there will be no debate, no vote, and the contempt resolutions will be magically and automatically be hereby adopted when this rule is adopted.

Now, if the majority believes the contempt resolution to be correct, the just and proper course of action to assert the rights of this institution would be to debate and vote on the resolution.

The majority leadership is subverting the rights of every Member of this House, allegedly in order to assert the rights of this House. The irony can escape no one. These are the constitutional rights of this institution that are in question, and not one Member of this institution is going to be allowed to discuss it or vote, to have a vote on these resolutions.

The majority's attempt to rush this contempt resolution through the House will have repercussions that many Members may not be aware of. And so I urge my colleagues to pay close attention because, by this action, the House majority risks causing great harm. It risks causing grave harm and undermining Congress's oversight authority for generations to come, and here is why.

The administration is claiming executive privilege, and any attempt to force testimony from the President's former counsel and his Chief of Staff will be fought by the administration within the courts. This could very possibly lead to the courts ruling that Congress does not have civil contempt authority, for example; that the U.S. Attorney, for example, does not have to prosecute criminal citations against executive officials or that the President's senior advisors are absolutely immune from compelled testimony before Congress. Any of those rulings would weaken Congress's ability to conduct oversight in the future, and a weakened Congress means a strengthened executive.

This is not an extreme or farfetched theory, Madam Speaker. Administrations from both parties have claimed executive privilege for many decades. The former Attorney General, for example, Janet Reno, stated, and I quote, "The President and his immediate advisors are absolutely immune from testimonial compulsion by a congressional committee, because subjecting a senior Presidential advisor to the congressional subpoena power would be akin to requiring the President himself to appear before Congress on matters relating to his constitutionally assigned functions."

What the majority is doing today is needlessly tempting a court loss that

could gravely undermine Congress's oversight authority, the very authority the majority is allegedly seeking to protect. If Congress loses in the courts, we could forever disable one of our most important powers, the power of oversight. And for what in return, Madam Speaker? Harriet Miers is no longer with the administration; Alberto Gonzales is no longer Attorney General. But the majority, with its action today, risks quite a bit.

Let's remember, Members will not even get the opportunity to vote on these resolutions today. And that's not only uncalled for, but absolutely unprecedented. Members will only be able to vote on this rule. Once the rule passes, so do the two resolutions and so does the majority's gamble.

So, back in July, the Judiciary Committee cited both Mr. Bolton and Ms. Miers for contempt of Congress. Now, here we are, 8 months later, considering these two contempt resolutions, but not really, just the rule. By passing the rule, automatically those contempt resolution will be passed, after an emergency Rules Committee meeting last night.

So the question is, why the rush? For some reason the majority feels that after 8 months, now this is a pressing issue. But I can think of a large list of other issues that I feel that Americans would rather we address; none more than considering the FISA bill that the Senate approved this week to give the administration the ability to protect the United States from terrorist attacks.

The tragic events of September 11, 2001, taught us many lessons, and one of the lessons we learned that day was that our Nation must remain aggressive in our fight against international terrorism. We must always stay one step ahead of those who wish to harm America, and now is not the time to tie the hands of our intelligence community. And the majority seeks to leave today and go home without addressing this issue.

The modernization of the foreign intelligence surveillance into the 21st century is a critically important national priority, and I'm pleased that several of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle agree as well.

On January 28, 21 members of the Blue Dog Coalition sent a letter to the Speaker in support of the Senate FISA legislation. The letter states, and I quote, "The Senate FISA Rockefeller-Bond legislation contains satisfactory language addressing all these issues, and we would fully support the measure should it reach the House floor without substantial change. We believe these components will ensure a strong national security apparatus that can thwart terrorism across the globe and save American lives here at home."

Madam Speaker, I will insert the letter sent by the Blue Dogs to the Speaker into the RECORD.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Legislation reforming the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance

Act (FISA) is currently being considered by the Senate. Following the Senate's passage of a FISA bill, it will be necessary for the House to quickly consider FISA legislation to get a bill to the President before the Protect America Act expires in February.

It is our belief that such legislation should include the following provisions: Require individualized warrants for surveillance of U.S. citizens living or traveling abroad; Clarify that no court order is required to conduct surveillance of foreign-to-foreign communications that are routed through the United States; Provide enhanced oversight by Congress of surveillance laws and procedures; Compel compliance by private sector partners; Review by FISA Court of minimization procedures; Targeted immunity for carriers that participated in anti-terrorism surveillance programs.

The Rockefeller-Bond FISA legislation contains satisfactory language addressing all these issues and we would fully support that measure should it reach the House floor without substantial change. We believe these components will ensure a strong national security apparatus that can thwart terrorism across the globe and save American lives here in our country.

It is also critical that we update the FISA laws in a timely manner. To pass a long-term extension of the Protect America Act, as some may suggest, would leave in place a limited, stopgap measure that does not fully address critical surveillance issues. We have it within our ability to replace the expiring Protect America Act by passing strong, bipartisan FISA modernization legislation that can be signed into law and we should do so—the consequences of not passing such a measure could place our national security at undue risk.

Sincerely,

Leonard L. Boswell, —, Mike Ross, Bud Cramer, Heath Shuler, Allen Boyd, Dan Boren, Jim Matheson, Lincoln Davis, Tim Holden, Dennis Moore, Earl Pomeroy, Melissa L. Bean, John Barrow, Joe Baca, John Tanner, Jim Cooper, Zachary T. Space, Brad Ellsworth, Charlie Melancon, Christopher P. Carney.

The extension of this important program is set to expire at 11:59 p.m. tomorrow night. After that, our ability to conduct surveillance on foreign terrorists will be severely hampered. It's time to make our country safer, and Congress needs to act today. The House should vote on the Senate measure, and we should do it now, instead of debating these contempt motions in an unprecedented and uncalled-for fashion.

Today I will give all Members of the House an opportunity to vote on a bipartisan, long-term modernization of FISA. I call on my colleagues to join with me in defeating the previous question so that we can immediately move to concur in the Senate amendment and send the bill to the President to be signed into law before the current law expires and our Nation is at greater risk.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the amendment and extraneous material inserted into the RECORD prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan, the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. CONYERS.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I will insert into the RECORD from today's New York Times, "Time to Vote Contempt."

[From the New York Times, Feb. 14, 2008]

TIME TO VOTE CONTEMPT

Alberto Gonzales may be out, but the country is still waiting for a full accounting of how he and his White House patrons cynically politicized the Justice Department. Congress is rightly asking questions about the actions of yet another United States attorney: New Jersey's Christopher J. Christie. The House also needs to stop procrastinating and vote to hold witnesses in contempt for refusing to testify in the wider scandal.

Federal prosecutors must be scrupulously nonpartisan. Mr. Christie, a Republican activist who got his job despite a lack of trial and criminal-law experience, has gone up to the line of acceptable behavior—and possibly crossed it.

He began an investigation of Senator Robert Menendez, a New Jersey Democrat, late in a hard-fought election campaign. The charges now appear baseless, but at the time the news provided a big boost to Mr. Menendez's Republican opponent. Mr. Christie went against a long Justice Department presumption against opening investigations or bringing indictments right before an election, to avoid affecting the outcome.

There are also questions about Mr. Christie's decision to award, without competitive bidding, a lucrative contract to monitor a company accused of consumer fraud. The winner? Former Attorney General John Ashcroft, an influential Republican who was once Mr. Christie's boss. Senate and House leaders have asked the Government Accountability Office to investigate.

Some of the people who likely know the most about the role politics has played in the Bush Justice Department have defied Congressional subpoenas to testify. Joshua Bolten, the White House chief of staff, and Harriet Miers, the former White House counsel, contend that they are protected from testifying by executive privilege. That is not enough. They have a legal obligation to appear before Congress and plead that privilege to specific questions.

The House Judiciary Committee voted in July to hold Mr. Bolten and Ms. Miers in contempt. The House's Democratic leadership has been trying to figure out the pros and cons ever since. The public needs to hear the testimony of these officials (along with Karl Rove, who is also refusing to appear), and the full House should vote as quickly as possible to hold them in contempt.

The House should also approve a resolution authorizing the Judiciary Committee to go to court to enforce the contempt citations if the current attorney general, Michael Mukasey, as expected, refuses to do so.

The stakes are high. There are people in jail today, including a former governor of Alabama, who have raised credible charges that they were put there for political reasons. Congress's constitutionally guaranteed powers are also at risk. If Congress fails to enforce its own subpoenas, it would effectively be ceding its subpoena power. It would also be giving its tacit consent to the dangerous idea of an imperial president—above

the law and beyond the reach of checks and balances.

The founders did not want that when they wrote the Constitution, and the voters who elected this Congress do not want it today.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, the resolution we are considering today is not steps that I take as chairman easily or lightly. It's been 8 months that we've tried to negotiate, nine letters, but this is what is necessary to protect the constitutional prerogatives as a coequal branch of government in this democracy of ours.

I believe the investigation we have been engaged in is an important one. And it's not about whether the U.S. Attorneys can serve at the pleasure of the President. They clearly can and do. But it concerns whether the American people can be assured that their laws are being fairly and impartially enforced by the United States Department of Justice. That's why we're here.

In order to pursue this investigation, we've done what committees in the Congress have traditionally done: We've sought our documents and testimony initially on a voluntary basis and through compulsory process only as a last resort. The investigation did not begin with the White House but has ended up there only after the review of thousands of pages of documents and obtaining the testimony and interviews of nearly 20 current and former Department of Justice employees.

□ 1215

We have been open at all times to any reasonable compromise and have been fully respectful and cognizant of the prerogatives of the executive branch. As a matter of fact, I have written the White House counsel on no less than nine separate occasions, and talked with him seeking a compromise on this matter.

What I am not open to, as the chairman of Judiciary, is accepting a take-it-or-leave-it offer which would not allow us access to information that we need, would not even provide for a transcript, and would prevent us from seeking any additional information in the future. That is the only proposal we've ever received from White House counsel, and so I would hope that all of the Members in this body, as an institutional matter, recognize the problems inherent in such an approach.

Now, some may argue that the stakes in this confrontation, and I think that's what's been suggested already, are so high that we cannot afford to risk that we might lose. Well, I'd say to them that if we countenance a process where our subpoenas can be readily ignored, where a witness under a duly authorized subpoena doesn't even have to bother to show up or tell us that they're not coming, where privilege can be asserted on the thinnest of bases and in the broadest possible manner, then we've already lost.

This is not a matter of vindicating the Judiciary Committee; and if you're really concerned about Congress'

rights, which I think all of us are, you would contact the White House counsel's office.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. SMITH of Texas.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule.

Yesterday, House Democrats said that Congress does not have enough time to pass critical FISA modernization legislation to keep America safe from foreign terrorists. Today, we are wasting Congress' time on an issue that does nothing to make our Nation safer. Clearly, the Democratic majority is out of touch with the needs of our intelligence community and is placing Americans' lives at risk.

On the eve of the expiration of critical intelligence legislation, the House Democratic majority has chosen to put extreme partisanship ahead of our country's safety. Apparently, the Democratic majority cares more about the alleged steroid use of a few baseball players and the personnel decisions of the White House than they do about promoting national security.

Last year, Admiral McConnell, the Director of National Intelligence, warned Congress that the intelligence community was missing two-thirds of all overseas terrorist communications, endangering Americans' lives. Congress enacted the Protect America Act to close this terrorist loophole.

Now House Democrats are going to let the Protect America Act expire. If the act expires, we will return to the status quo, unable to begin any new foreign intelligence surveillance without a court order and risk losing two-thirds of all foreign intelligence.

Today we find ourselves at two very dangerous thresholds: first, expiration of legislation vital to this Nation's national security, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. The House Democratic majority has let this legislation lapse without even allowing a straight up-or-down vote on the bipartisan Senate bill approved earlier this week by a vote of 68-29. Instead of reauthorizing FISA, the Democratic majority chooses to take us to another threshold, that of a needless constitutional confrontation in the courts over the dismissal of a handful of United States Attorneys.

We know that the President has the authority to dismiss U.S. Attorneys. We know that his executive privilege claims are consistent with those made by previous Presidents for decades. We know that by tilting at the executive privilege windmill we risk severely undermining the very oversight authority we would want to protect. But most of all, we know that reauthorization of FISA is infinitely more important than this spat over executive privilege.

Once again, we see why Congress' approval rating is at an historic low. It's

because the Democratic majority engages in extreme partisanship and ignores the people's business.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I am not overly concerned by what the courts ultimately decide executive privilege covers. The Bush administration's claim of executive privilege here goes well beyond any privilege ever recognized by any court decision, but the Republic can obviously survive a court decision on the narrow question of the exact extent of executive privilege.

But, Madam Speaker, the courts must decide. The President cannot decide by decree. The President cannot announce with absolute, unreviewable authority what information the administration will provide or withhold.

The Framers of our Constitution had just fought a war against an autocratic King. It is inconceivable that they intended to create an executive with the powers that the Bush administration now claims and that the minority now supports.

For the entire history of our Republic, our courts have recognized that Congress needs information to carry out our constitutional duties, to decide what the laws should be, to decide what to appropriate Federal funds for, and that we cannot rely on information that is voluntarily, cheerfully provided. Congress must have the power to require information, including information that the President does not want to provide, that the President sees as inconvenient or embarrassing.

We must inquire into the need for new laws. We must inquire into how existing laws are being administered. And the Supreme Court said half a century ago that Congress' investigative powers are never greater than when inquiring into abuse of authority or corruption by Federal Government agencies.

Madam Speaker, the allegations here are very serious. Does the minority think that these are trivial allegations? Prosecutorial decisions cannot be used to reward political friends or punish enemies. Elections have consequences, Madam Speaker; but they should never have these consequences, not in America. Criminal prosecutions guided by political concerns are fundamentally incompatible with democracy and the rule of law.

The two resolutions that we are considering will allow the courts to decide these questions of what information Congress can require in the discharge of our constitutional duties. It will allow important constitutional questions to be decided, as they should be decided in a democracy, by the courts.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished minority whip, Mr. BLUNT of Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I'm

here to say that I am fully supportive of the prerogatives of the Congress. I think the Congress has a right to ask for, receive, demand information from the administration; but I don't think that right extends to this case.

I think the idea that we would expect to get information that is dealing with advice to the President on the status of at-will employees is a loser for us on the House floor. It's a loser for us in court. It will set back the prerogatives of the Congress; and beyond that, I think the idea that we're here today, as we see the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act get less value to us every day because we're unwilling to deal with a permanent solution, this is the wrong debate to have at any time. It's certainly the wrong debate to have at this time.

And the idea that somehow if we extend that act, if we've done all we could do by trying to extend an act, a bipartisan group of Members of this Congress for various reasons said we don't want to extend and then we come back today and we take our time focusing on a contempt charge on two dedicated civil servants is the wrong thing to do at any time, and it's particularly the wrong thing to do at this time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished Speaker of the House, the Honorable NANCY PELOSI of California.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlelady, the Chair of the Rules Committee, for yielding.

Today is a very sad day for us for more than one reason. One reason is, though, the matter that is before us. I had hoped, frankly, that this day would never have come, that the respectful negotiations that should take place between article I, the legislative branch, and article II, the executive branch, would have yielded the information that is necessary for Congress to make its decisions.

I thank Chairman CONYERS for his distinguished lifetime leadership of protecting the Constitution of the United States. We all take that oath of office, every single one of us who serves. Indeed, every person who serves in any civic capacity in our country does so. Today, we are honoring our oath of office with this resolution that is before us.

Again, I rise in sadness, not in confrontation. This is not a conflict that the Congress has sought. In fact, as the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee has indicated, the committee has repeatedly sought to avoid confrontation, repeatedly making requests that have been ignored or rejected by the White House on completely unacceptable terms.

The Judiciary Committee, indeed the Congress, is clearly entitled to this information. It involves neither national security information nor communications with the President. The President has no grounds to assert executive privilege.

On the other hand, Congress has the responsibility of oversight of the execu-

utive branch. I know that Members on both sides of the aisle take that responsibility very seriously. Oversight is an institutional obligation to ensure against abuse of power, in this case the politicizing of the Department of Justice. Subpoena authority is a vital tool for that oversight.

Today, we seek to require the Department of Justice to bring contempt motions against Harriet Miers and Josh Bolten. When our resolution passes, we hope the administration will realize that this House of Representatives, this Congress, is serious about our constitutional role of oversight and will reach a settlement with us over the documents and testimony at issue. I still hold out the hope that they will cooperate.

But if the administration fails to do so, and if it orders the Department of Justice not to file contempt proceedings, we will then, through this resolution, have the power ourselves to go to Federal court and seek civil enforcement of our subpoenas.

The resolution before us today should not be a partisan issue. It should not be. This isn't about Democrats or Republicans. Former Congressman Mickey Edwards, who once served in the Republican leadership, has said that the enforcement of the subpoenas in the U.S. Attorney matter is about defending Congress, not a Democratic or a Republican Congress, but the people's Congress, as a separate, independent, and completely equal branch of government.

The subject of the Judiciary Committee's investigation involves serious and credible allegations that Federal law enforcement was politicized. Political manipulation of law enforcement undermines public confidence in our criminal justice system. Congress must find out what happened not just in terms of those who were fired but also whether improper criteria were used to retain the remaining U.S. Attorneys.

□ 1230

We must have the information in order to protect against political manipulation of law enforcement, and it must be provided in terms consistent with our constitutional obligations.

The so-called White House offer refused to permit even a transcript of any interviews and to permit questions on discussions and required the committee to promise in advance not to seek further information. This is beyond arrogance; this is hubris taken to the ultimate degree.

As former Congressman Edwards, again I remind, a former member of the Republican leadership in the House, said, "No Congress, indeed, no lawyer, would ever agree to such an outrageous demand."

Madam Speaker, we must continue in our efforts to restore our Nation's fundamental system of checks and balances. This Congress and future Congresses must have the ability to conduct meaningful oversight. It is the

hallmark of our constitutional democracy that has served us well for more than two centuries.

Thank you, again, Chairman CONYERS, for your leadership, Congresswoman LINDA SANCHEZ, chairwoman of the subcommittee that dealt with this issue, Chairwoman LOUISE SLAUGHTER, for the important work of the Rules Committee on all of this. To the new Members of Congress, on this issue of article I led by JOHN YARMUTH, article I, protecting the prerogatives of the Congress of the United States, we thank our new Members for their leadership honoring their oath of office. And BRAD MILLER, an expert on the subject in the Congress, has been a tremendous resource to us as well.

Let us uphold our oath of office by voting for this resolution, my colleagues. Let us restore the rule of law. Let us act to protect and defend our constitution by ensuring appropriate congressional oversight in all areas essential to the well-being of the American people.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Rules Committee, Mr. DREIER of California.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, Speaker PELOSI is absolutely right, this is a very, very sad day for all of us. We just memorialized our colleague, Tom Lantos, and we have come back today to deal with an issue which I believe is one that creates the potential to undermine the power of the first branch of government.

Now, as has been said, if we looked at the potential court challenge that we can see, this notion that has been put forward by our former colleague, Mr. Edwards, that we are, in fact, a separate, independent, and equal branch of government could be thrown out the window.

The other thing that's very sad about today, Madam Speaker, is the fact that we are here with an absolutely unprecedented rule. Never before in the history of the Republic has there been such a rule. This rule actually undermines the deliberative nature of the people's House. What we're doing is we are saying that there will be no debate whatsoever, no debate whatsoever on these very important two contempt resolutions, no debate whatsoever. When this rule is adopted, we will see those two measures hereby adopted, meaning that there will be no chance for us to, as a House, have the kind of debate that we did for an hour upstairs in the Rules Committee. And so, we're throwing out the window the notion of participation in a free and open debate.

And Madam Speaker, the other thing that is very sad about today is that, while we were promised 1 year ago last month a new direction for America, a

new era of openness, an opportunity for free-flowing debate, we will, with passage of this resolution, be on the brink of seeing the 110th Congress, and I will say to the distinguished chair of the Committee on Rules, since she is presiding over this, Madam Speaker, we will have, this Congress, adopted more closed rules than any Congress in the history of the Republic.

I urge a "no" vote on this rule. And I urge strong support for the resolution which will allow us to finally bring about modernization of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished majority leader of the House, Mr. HOYER of Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

We are dealing, in these days, with serious issues. And serious people have been considering these issues in committee, and we will now consider them on the floor. This matter has been pending now for over half a year.

Madam Speaker, in 1885, a young scholar wrote an influential book about the United States Congress entitled "Congressional Government." And in that book he offered the following observations about legislative branch oversight, and he said this, "Quite as important as legislation is vigilant oversight of the administration. Not any particular administration, but of the other coequal branch of government."

He continued, "It is the proper duty of a representative body to look diligently into every affair of government and to talk much about what it sees. The informing function of Congress, not just informing ourselves, but informing the American public as well, the informing function of Congress should be preferred even to its legislative function." An interesting observation. Many years later, in 1913, that young scholar, Woodrow Wilson, became President of the United States.

Congressional oversight of any administration is absolutely imperative to the proper functioning of our government, to our system of checks and balances, and to the fulfillment of our constitutional duty. A President who is forced to answer for his administration's actions, decisions, and conduct is a President who is less likely to amass power beyond that which the Constitution proscribes for his office or to imperil the welfare of our republic form of government. And that is the constitutional interest that today's resolution addresses.

I support the rule before us because I believe in a system of checks and balances in which no branch holds itself above the constitutional objectives of the sharing of authority, which the Founders wisely believed was essential to protect against the abuse of that authority by any one of those branches.

The issue before this body is not fundamentally whether the current administration acted properly and within

the law when it dismissed seven U.S. attorneys in 2006, that may be the issue at some point in time, but unless we have the information to get to that point, such a question will be moot. Nor is this a partisan clash between a Democratic House and a Republican President. Rather, the basic issue before this House is this: whether this body and the committee system, which is central to our duties to perform meaningful and vigorous oversight, can simply be ignored by the executive branch when this body seeks testimony and documents relevant to an important public policy controversy.

As the New York Times noted this morning, "If Congress fails to enforce its own subpoenas, it would effectively be ceding subpoena power. It would also be giving its tacit consent to the dangerous idea of an imperial President, above the law, and beyond the reach of checks and balances."

What profit it a Nation if we include checks and balances within our constitutional framework to protect our country's freedom, and more importantly, our people's freedom, if, in fact, we honor it only in the breach? And as Bruce Fein, the constitutional scholar and former Department of Justice official during the Reagan administration, has stated, "If Congress shies from voting for contempt in this case, secret government will become the rule." This is perhaps the most secretive administration in our history. This is a danger to our democracy.

He went on to say "that Congress would be reduced to an ink blot on the constitutional map." That is why every one of us, every one of the 435 of us who have sworn an oath to defend the Constitution of the United States and uphold its laws, ought to vote for this resolution, because it does not matter whether there is a Republican President or a Democratic President, for them to refuse to respond to a subpoena of the Congress of the United States, and to even come here and claim a privilege, which they have not, our democracy will be lessened.

I urge my colleagues to carry out the intent and the vision of the Founders and the writers of our Constitution. Support this resolution.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I would remind our colleagues that one of the reasons why the minority is outraged with the conduct of the majority today is that we are not even allowed to debate nor vote on the contempt resolutions, but rather on a rule that will self-adopt, automatically adopt even resolutions of this magnitude of importance; totally unprecedented and uncalled for.

Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution.

Yesterday, the Democratic leadership tried to sweep a bipartisan FISA bill under the rug, and today they're trying to throw the President's Chief of Staff in jail. I am curious to know what happened to the pledge of partnership with Republicans in Congress, and with the President, and not partisanship.

The vote we are going to take this afternoon has been festering since July, when the House Judiciary Committee decided to vote on holding White House officials in contempt. This pandering to the left reflected a political and unnecessary escalation on the part of the Democratic majority.

The contempt resolution was approved on a straight party line vote in the committee, and today's vote will be the same. The threat of losing in court should be enough for this institution to back down from this escalation.

My concern with the Democratic leadership's course of action is that it will likely weaken Congress' position in situations where we disagree with the President on matters of executive privilege. If the Speaker and the House Judiciary Committee chairman really cared about getting to the bottom of this matter, they could have taken the nonpolitical route, such as directing the House Office of General Counsel to file a civil lawsuit with the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. This proposal, which I suggested last summer, would be a legitimate effort to resolve our issues with the President in an arena where the Congress would have equal footing.

So, what's next? How will we rehabilitate our image to give the public confidence in the Congress? I don't think throwing the President's Chief of Staff in jail will do the trick.

It amazes me that the Democratic leadership would bring such a divisive matter to the floor so soon after receiving accolades for working so well with the minority to pass an economic stimulus package.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this resolution.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York, a member of the Rules Committee, Mr. ARCURI.

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Chairman, today is not about a FISA debate. Actually, it's not even about whether or not Ms. Miers and Mr. Bolten have a right to claim an executive privilege. What it is about is does a person in this country have to follow the laws of the United States, follow the rule of law, follow the Constitution and abide by a legally administered subpoena.

And I guess the best way to talk about that is to draw a comparison. Under the Constitution, a person has an absolute right to claim their fifth amendment right against self-incrimination. So, if a person is subpoenaed to testify in a criminal matter, they can't call the judge up and say, "Judge, I think I might have a fifth amendment problem here. I'm not going to show up." The judge will tell them they have

to be in court and they have to assert their fifth amendment right after they are asked a question. The same thing applies here. They have to appear before Congress and at least assert that right before they can claim some kind of privilege; otherwise, the entire system falls apart.

Oh, today is a very important day for Congress. We are taking up a very, very important measure, and that is the Constitution going to be followed and are we going to do our constitutional job.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Member from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

□ 1245

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I have prepared a whole series of remarks to respond to the comments made on the floor as to the substance of the concept citation. Unfortunately, because we're only able to debate the rule, we don't have time to do that. Let me just try to make a couple of points here very quickly.

First of all, the question is, is this the most important thing we should be doing today? Is there a time limit on the action of the House of Representatives that requires us to act on this today? And the answer is no. This doesn't expire today. It doesn't expire tomorrow. It doesn't expire the next day. We are able to do this anytime until the end of this Congress.

But what does expire? The Protect America Act. It expires at midnight tomorrow. We should be doing the Nation's business with respect to that, rather than this. If, in fact, we are serious about the war on terror; if, in fact, we are serious about gathering that information which is necessary to protect us against those who would harm us and those we represent, we would be acting on the FISA Act reconstitution here today. We'd be acting on the Senate bill. That's the time limit.

There is no reason for scheduling this today. We have had 8 months to schedule this. But yet we find that this is what we're going to be dealing with before we go home. And we're going to say it is unimportant as to whether or not we would continue with the Protect America Act. Unimportant except in the opinion of the number one intelligence officer in the United States, Admiral McConnell, who served under Democrat and Republican administrations, who told us if we allow this to go down, that is, the Protect America Act, we will close our eyes for 60 percent of the legitimate terrorist targets around the world prospectively.

What are we doing here?

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California, the Chair of the Commercial and Administrative Law Subcommittee (Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ).

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, we have reluc-

tantly reached today's vote to hold former White House Counsel Harriet Miers and White House Chief of Staff Joshua Bolten in contempt of Congress.

Since March 9 of 2007, Chairman CONYERS and I have patiently negotiated in good faith to reach an accommodation with the White House for documents and testimony relevant to the U.S. Attorney investigation.

Mr. CANNON. Madam Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California. Under normal instances, I would, but I don't have the time. I apologize.

Mr. CANNON. I hope the gentlewoman will remain on the floor so that on my time I will be able to yield for a colloquy.

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California. I apologize to the gentleman, but this is my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will proceed.

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, we have patiently negotiated in good faith to reach an accommodation with the White House for documents and testimony relevant to the U.S. Attorney investigation. Unfortunately, the White House has stubbornly refused to move off its opening position, an unreasonable offer that testimony be given without an oath or a transcript and that any testimony and documents provided exclude internal White House communications. To have negotiations, concessions by both sides are necessary. Otherwise, it's just capitulation.

I was extremely disappointed that Ms. Miers, Mr. Bolten, and the White House based their refusal to comply with our subpoenas on sweeping claims of executive privilege and immunity that some experts have called "Nixonian in breadth." The subcommittee carefully considered these claims in two separate meetings last year. In detailed rulings, I found that these claims were not properly asserted and were not legally valid. Even if the claims were properly asserted and legally valid, the strong public need for information about the U.S. Attorney firings substantially outweighs the assertion of executive privilege here.

I was also very disappointed to hear from Attorney General Mukasey in testimony before the Judiciary Committee last week that he will direct the D.C. U.S. Attorney not to comply with the contempt statute, which provides that the U.S. Attorney "shall" refer the contempt citation to a grand jury for action after receiving it from the Speaker.

Members on both sides of the aisle should recognize the gravity of this vote. If the executive branch is allowed to simply ignore congressional subpoenas while Congress stands idly by, we will have abdicated our role of oversight of the executive branch and undermined our system of checks and balances. Further, our lack of action will

be cited by future Presidents as justification for questionable claims of executive privilege.

I hope that my colleagues on the other side will stand together in support of this body's institutional prerogatives. Time is long overdue for Congress to reassert itself as a co-equal branch of government.

I urge support of the rule and House resolutions 979 and 980.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON).

Mr. CANNON. Madam Speaker, I would ask the chairman of the Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law, who has oversight of this matter and which committee I rank on, to remain on the floor so we could have a colloquy on this issue.

It appears that she has left the floor. That's unfortunate. Her response to my inquiry about yielding was that she didn't have enough time, and we are standing here today with very little time to debate an issue that is dramatically important. It's important for this institution, and, by the way, people on both sides of the aisle have said and the Speaker and majority leader have both made a point of how important this issue is to this body. It is vitally important to me that we retain the rights of this body as it relates to administration, whether that's a Republican administration or Democratic administration.

In his opening statements, Mr. DIAZ-BALART gave a quote from former Attorney General Janet Reno in which she said there was no right to do what we're trying to do today. I would have loved to have asked the chairman on the Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law if she thought that was the case or if she disagreed with what the scope of the right of the administration is to not appear.

Obviously, there is a sense in this case that we ought to get something done; and, in fact, we have done a great deal. We have had hundreds of hours of depositions, literally tens of thousands of pages, tens of thousands of e-mails. We have asked questions of everyone involved in the matter in the case. And what have we come up with? I wanted to ask the chairman what the evidence we are going to present to the U.S. Attorney is that he can take and say, I have a need to get this information from these people in the administration who won't show up to the House. I have a need to understand these facts which seem to be in confusion. I have a need to decide what between these two different stories is the truth.

But we haven't said that to him. We don't have evidence that we can give the U.S. Attorney. What we are giving to him is a desire to continue a witch hunt which has produced up to today zero, nothing, as far as I can tell; and I've been in every meeting, every hearing, and followed on every single deposition that we have had. There is nothing

that indicates that anybody has lied or that there is a reason that the White House has been involved. And, therefore, there is no reason that I can understand, and I have asked many times on the record in committee hearings what those reasons are, what it is, what the discrepancies, what the problems are for which we need to subpoena people in the White House and create a showdown, a showdown between our institution and the White House. And I ask the gentleman, as the chairman of the committee has just risen to his feet, and I would love to yield to him if he is willing to answer that question: What are the discrepancies?

Mr. CONYERS. We don't know because we can't get one sheet of paper from Mr. Bolten and nobody else will talk to us. That's precisely why we were forced to this position, sir.

Mr. CANNON. Reclaiming my time, Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's position. The gentleman has said that eloquently in the past on many occasions. But we are now talking about getting a subpoena, enforcing a subpoena in a criminal process against people for whom we have no evidence, as far as I can tell, and I will be happy to yield to the gentleman if he has evidence, no evidence that they have been involved.

There are no discrepancies in the testimony that we have had before us, is there?

Mr. CONYERS. If the gentleman is so kind to yield again, we don't have any evidence. We aren't accusing them of anything, sir. We're merely seeking the documents that could be relevant to the determination of whether the Department of Justice has been politicized.

Mr. CANNON. Reclaiming my time, Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's candor, and I appreciate the very gracious way the gentleman has handled this whole investigation. But it comes back down to this: we have no evidence.

Let me just finish by saying that having seen this, if there was a conspiracy, and I know that the majority believes there is something evil that is happening out there, then we ought to have given enough time and enough context to be able to track that down and prove that this administration has done something wrong.

As opposed to what the gentleman has just said, we have had a number of statements by the chairman of this committee saying that there is evidence of corruption. But we have had no evidence of corruption, none at all adduced anywhere from all the investigations we have done, and there is no basis for these contempt citations. I ask that we vote against them.

COOPER & KIRK,

Washington, DC, December 4, 2007.

HON. LAMAR S. SMITH,
Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SMITH: We write in response to your request for our views regarding the legal issues raised by the Judiciary Commit-

tee's resolution recommending that the House of Representatives find Harriet Miers and Joshua Bolten in contempt of Congress. Each of us has had substantial experience in the Executive Branch, including in the Office of Legal Counsel. Charles J. Cooper served as Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Legal Counsel from November 1985 through July 1988. Howard C. Nielson, Jr. served as Deputy Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Legal Counsel from June 2003 through August 2005. In addition, our law firm has successfully litigated a number of significant separation of powers cases.

We have reviewed the opinions of the Justice Department regarding the assertion of executive privilege and testimonial immunity in response to the Miers and Bolten subpoenas. We have also reviewed the committee report relating to this matter, the additional views of the Chairman and Subcommittee Chair, and the minority views. The positions asserted by the Administration reflect the longstanding and considered views of the Executive Branch, views repeatedly affirmed by Administrations of both parties. These views were held during our tenures in the Office of Legal Counsel, and we continue to believe that they are sound. Moreover, we believe that a decision by the House to hold Ms. Miers and Mr. Bolten in contempt would likely be a legally futile gesture that could ultimately undermine Congress's ability to obtain information from the Executive Branch.

As an initial matter, even if the House votes to hold Ms. Miers and Mr. Bolten in contempt, and even if a contempt citation is referred to the appropriate United States Attorney, the United States Attorney will have no choice but to decline to take action on the matter. It has long been the position of the Executive Branch that "the criminal contempt of Congress statute does not apply to the President or presidential subordinates who assert executive privilege." Application of 28 U.S.C. 458 to Presidential Appointments of Federal Judges, 19 Op. O.L.C. 350, 356 (1995) (opinion of Assistant Attorney General Walter Dellinger). As then-Assistant Attorney General Theodore B. Olson explained the position of the Executive Branch in 1984:

"First, as a matter of statutory interpretation reinforced by compelling separation of powers considerations, we believe that Congress may not direct the Executive to prosecute a particular individual without leaving any discretion to the Executive to determine whether a violation of the law has occurred. Second, as a matter of statutory interpretation and the constitutional separation of powers, we believe that the contempt of Congress statute was not intended to apply and could not constitutionally be applied to an Executive Branch official who asserts the President's claim of executive privilege in this context."

Prosecution for Contempt of Congress of an Executive Branch Official Who Has Asserted a Claim of Executive Privilege, 8 Op. O.L.C. 101, 102 (1984); see also *id.* at 119, 129 (documenting similar positions taken by the Eisenhower and Ford Administrations).

While the Chairman and Subcommittee Chair note that Justice Department opinions such as the Dellinger and Olson memoranda are not binding on Congress or the Judiciary, such opinions are binding on members of the Executive Branch—including the United States Attorney to whom a contempt citation would be referred. Furthermore, because a prosecutor's "decision whether or not to prosecute . . . generally rests entirely in his discretion," *Wayte v. United States*, 470 U.S. 598, 607 (1985), it is highly unlikely that Congress could obtain any sort of judicial review of the United States Attorney's refusal to submit the contempt citation to a grand jury.

Assuming Congress could somehow obtain judicial review of the claim of executive privilege, we believe that it could not overcome that claim on the facts presented here. To be sure, there is a paucity of judicial authority resolving executive privilege disputes between Congress and the Executive; still, the following factors should persuade a court to uphold the claim of executive privilege here.

First, the threshold arguments that executive privilege has not been, or cannot be, properly invoked to protect the communications at issue here appear insubstantial. The Chairman and Subcommittee Chair have identified no authority—and we are aware of none—requiring the Executive Branch to submit a privilege log to sustain a claim of executive privilege in a legislative proceeding. The letter sent to Chairman Conyers by Counsel to the President Fielding, written “at the direction of the President” to “advise and inform [Congress] that the President has decided to assert Executive Privilege,” Letter of Fred F. Fielding to Chairmen Leahy and Conyers at 1 (June 28, 2007), plainly suffices to invoke executive privilege under controlling precedent. See *In re Sealed Case*, 121 F.3d 729, 744, n.16 (D.C. Cir. 1997). And *In re Sealed Case* clearly establishes that executive privilege extends to “communications of presidential advisors which do not directly involve the President,” id. at 751, and protects “communications that these advisors and their staff author or solicit and receive in the course of performing their function of advising the President on official government matters”—whether or not the President is aware of those communications. Id. at 752. Given the essential role of the President in appointing and removing United States Attorneys, communications to or from senior presidential advisors regarding the replacement of United States Attorneys plainly fall within the scope of the privilege recognized by *In re Sealed Case*. As the D.C. Circuit explained, where “the President himself must directly exercise the presidential power of appointment and removal . . . there is assurance that even if the President were not a party to the communications over which the government is asserting presidential privilege, these communications nonetheless are intimately connected to his presidential decisionmaking.” Id. at 753.

Second, there is nothing novel or unprecedented in the claim of privilege here. On the contrary, many historical precedents support the Administration’s refusal to disclose confidential communications and deliberations relating to the appointment or dismissal of executive officers. For example, as early as 1886, the Cleveland Administration rejected Congress’s attempt to obtain communications relating to the dismissal of a district attorney (the historical predecessor of today’s U.S. Attorneys). As President Cleveland explained, “the documents related to an act (the suspension and removal of an Executive Branch official) which was exclusively a discretionary executive function.” *History of Refusals by Executive Branch Officials to Provide Information Demanded by Congress*, 6 Op. O.L.C. 751, 767 (1982) (opinion of Assistant Attorney General Theodore B. Olson); see also id. at 758–759 (discussing similar refusals to provide information regarding the appointment or removal of executive officers by the Jackson and Tyler Administrations). Furthermore, D.C. Circuit precedent addressing executive privilege expressly recognizes that “confidentiality is particularly critical in the appointment and removal context.” *In re Sealed Case*, 121 F.3d 729, 753 (D.C. Cir. 1997).

Third, when the judiciary has adjudicated executive privilege disputes between Con-

gress and the Executive, it has required Congress to establish that the information it seeks “is demonstrably critical to the responsible fulfillment of [Congress’s] functions” to overcome even a generalized claim of executive privilege. Senate Select Committee on *Presidential Campaign Activities v. Nixon*, 498 F.2d 725, 731 (D.C. Cir. 1974) (en banc). To satisfy this burden, it is not enough for Congress to show that the information it desires “may possibly have some arguable relevance to the subjects it has investigated and to the areas in which it may propose legislation.” Id. at 733. Rather, it must identify “specific legislative decisions that cannot responsibly be made without access to materials uniquely contained in” the documents or testimony it seeks. Id. Furthermore, decisions such as *United States v. Nixon*, 418 U.S. 683 (1974), and *In re Sealed Case* that limit executive privilege to accommodate the special needs of the criminal justice system offer little support for Congress here. As the D.C. Circuit has explained:

“There is a clear difference between Congress’s legislative tasks and the responsibility of a grand jury, or any institution engaged in like functions. While fact-finding by a legislative committee is undeniably a part of its task, legislative judgments normally depend more on the predicted consequences of proposed legislative actions and their political acceptability, than on precise reconstruction of past events; Congress frequently legislates on the basis of conflicting information provided in its hearings. In contrast, the responsibility of the grand jury turns entirely on its ability to determine whether there is probable cause to believe that certain named individuals did or did not commit specific crimes.”

Senate Select Committee, 498 F.2d at 732. Cf. *Nixon*, 418 U.S. at 713 (“Without access to specific facts a criminal prosecution may be totally frustrated.”).

Given the voluminous documentary evidence and testimony already provided by the Executive Branch—not to mention the additional documents and testimony that the White House has offered to make available in attempt to resolve this controversy, see e.g., Letter of Fred F. Fielding to Chairmen Leahy and Conyers at 1–2 (June 28, 2007)—it seems clear the lingering factual ambiguities identified by the Committee Chairman and the Subcommittee Chair are inadequate to overcome even a generalized claim of executive privilege under controlling precedent. And a judicial determination to that effect would plainly prejudice Congress’s ability to obtain sensitive information from the Executive Branch not only in this investigation but in future investigations as well.

The Justice Department’s determination that Ms. Miers is immune from compulsion to testify before Congress likewise reflects the longstanding and consistent position of the Executive Branch. As Attorney General Reno explained in a formal opinion to the President, “It is the longstanding position of the executive branch that ‘the President and his immediate advisors are absolutely immune from testimonial compulsion by a Congressional committee.’” Assertion of Executive Privilege with Respect to Clemency Decision, 23 Op. O.L.C. 1, 4 (1999) (quoting Memorandum from John M. Harmon, Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legal Counsel, Re: Executive Privilege at 5 (May 23, 1977). This view is not only that of the current Administration and the Clinton Administration. As documented in Attorney General Reno’s opinion, this view also reflects the position of the Reagan, Carter, and Nixon Administrations. See id. (collecting opinions from Assistant Attorneys General Theodore B. Olson, John M. Harmon, Roger C. Crampton, and William H. Rehnquist).

This view also reflects the position of the Johnson and Truman Administrations. See *History of Refusals*, 6 Op. O.L.C. at 771–72, 777–78. And as documented by the Justice Department in its opinion regarding Ms. Miers, the Executive Branch—including, again, Administrations of both parties—have long taken the position that the same immunity extends to former Presidents and their Advisors. See Memorandum from Stephen G. Bradbury, Principal Assistant Attorney General Office of Legal Counsel, Re: Immunity of Former Counsel to the President from Compelled Testimony at 2–3 (July 10, 2007) (documenting positions taken by the Truman and Nixon Administrations).

In short, we believe the President’s assertions of executive privilege and testimonial immunity in this instance are entirely constitutionally sound. We also believe that a determination by the House to hold Mr. Bolten and Ms. Miers in contempt of Congress would be futile as a legal matter and might ultimately prejudice Congress’s ability to obtain information from the Executive Branch.

Sincerely,

CHARLES J. COOPER.

HOWARD C. NIELSON, JR.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the distinguished chairwoman from the Rules Committee, a native Kentuckian and someone who has always stood for the finest traditions of this body.

In November of 2006, the American people decided to give the Democrats the control of the House of Representatives and the Congress. I was fortunate enough to be elected as one of the 43 new Democrats in that class.

And many people have said, in examining that election, oh, we were elected because of the war in Iraq. But that’s not what I heard. What I heard when I was campaigning in 2006, and I think most of my colleagues in this class would say the same thing, is we want to return the Government to the tenets of the Constitution. We want to restore the checks and balances that the Founding Fathers prescribed. We want to make sure that this President and every President is held accountable, is not above the law.

So when we came here, one of the things we did was to start talking about article I, which established that all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States. We started wearing these buttons, article I buttons, and we offered them to Members of both parties, hoping that this would not be a partisan issue and not be an expression of partisanship but, instead, a respect for the integrity of this institution.

Unfortunately, most of my colleagues on the other side chose not to wear these buttons. They have chosen to make this a partisan issue in spite of the fact that during the last 6 years before we took control of the Congress, no subpoenas were issued against this President. No efforts to hold him accountable were made, in spite of the fact that in the prior administration a thousand subpoenas were offered by the Republican Congress to the Democratic President.

So, unfortunately, this has become a partisan issue when it shouldn't be. To me this is all about institutional integrity, about restoring the checks and balances.

Fundamental to our power, legislative power, is our ability to gather information. If we do not stand up for our right to gather information, then in spite of the fact that my colleagues on the other side have said we may lose our prerogatives if we go to court, if we don't challenge the President on this issue, we will have surrendered our prerogatives; and that is the worst fate that we could commit this body to.

So I would say, in closing, that many people look at polls today and say the standing of the Congress is at its lowest ebb ever, and they say maybe that's because we are not doing anything. I think it's because the American people recognize that we have been negligent in not upholding our responsibilities under the Constitution.

This is an important step in restoring the integrity of this institution and restoring the confidence of the American people in this body in its willingness to respond to the dictates of the Constitution.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, rather than spinning our wheels on this issue, there is a much more important issue that we should be dealing with today, and the very safety of our Nation is at issue. I'm disappointed that we have reached the point in this House that reasonable minds could not prevail on an issue that involves the very safety of the American people.

Last August Congress passed, and the President signed into law, the Protect America Act. This critical legislation closed the gaps which had previously caused the intelligence community to miss more than two-thirds of all overseas terrorist communications, finally allowing the United States to stay one step ahead of the terrorists.

The Senate amendments to H.R. 3773 would enable law enforcement and the intelligence community to continue their counterterrorism efforts, including working with telecommunications companies and allowing officials to gather intelligence from potential foreign terrorists outside the United States.

At the same time, this bill is mindful of our Constitution and the protections it affords to U.S. citizens, whether they are inside or outside the United States. Furthermore, the authority provided by the bill would sunset in 6 years, allowing Congress to revisit any issues that might arise.

We cannot afford to let the terrorists, particularly those who are conspiring abroad, to have the upper hand. Our law enforcement and intelligence communities must have every resource available to do their jobs in keeping this Nation safe. I urge my colleagues

to support the United States, not the terrorists, by passing the Senate amendments to H.R. 3773.

And I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

□ 1300

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), Chair of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CONYERS. I wanted to respond, or continue our discussion that was raised by the gentleman from Utah. As a matter of fact, in our resolution recommending that contempt of Congress be issued, we found plenty of evidence of wrongdoing at the Department of Justice, nearly 100 pages of it. This was voted out of the committee. For example:

The decision to fire or retain some U.S. attorneys may have been based in part on whether or not their offices were pursuing or not pursuing public corruption or vote fraud cases based on partisan political factors;

Department officials appear to have made false or misleading statements to Congress, many of which sought to minimize the role of White House personnel in the U.S. Attorney firings;

Actions by some department personnel may have violated civil service laws.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

To date, the committee's investigation—which has reviewed materials provided by the Department of Justice in depth and obtained testimony from 20 current and former Department of Justice employees—has uncovered serious evidence of wrongdoing by the Department and White House staff with respect to the forced resignations of U.S. Attorneys during 2006 and related matters. This includes evidence that: (a) the decision to fire or retain some U.S. Attorneys may have been based in part on whether or not their offices were pursuing or not pursuing public corruption or vote fraud cases based on partisan political factors, or otherwise bringing cases which could have an impact on pending elections; (b) Department officials appear to have made false or misleading statements to Congress, many of which sought to minimize the role of White House personnel in the U.S. Attorney firings, or otherwise obstruct the Committee's investigation, and with some participation by White House personnel; and (c) actions by some Department personnel may have violated civil service laws and some White House employees may have violated the Presidential Records Act.

Based on this evidence, and because of the apparent involvement of White House personnel in the U.S. Attorney firings and their aftermath, the committee has sought to obtain relevant documents from the White House and documents and testimony from former White House Counsel Harriet Miers—who appears to have been significantly involved in the matter—on a voluntary basis and, only after taking all reasonable efforts to obtain a compromise, on a compulsory basis. The committee's subpoenas have been met with consistent resistance, including wide-ranging assertions of executive privilege and immunity from testimony. This has gone so far that the administration indicated in July that it would refuse to allow the District of Columbia U.S. Attorney's office to pursue any congressional contempt citation against the White House's wishes. In addition

to the many infirmities and deficiencies in the manner in which the White House Counsel has sought to assert executive privilege, in the present circumstance such privilege claims would be strongly outweighed by the committee's need to obtain such information.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I would ask the distinguished chairwoman how many speakers she has remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Possibly five, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 4 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I reserve at this time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON) who serves on both the Committee on Rules and Judiciary.

Ms. SUTTON. Madam Speaker, let us recall what this is all about. We are here today because the now-resigned Chief of Staff to former attorney, Alberto Gonzalez, ran a plan over a period of just under 2 years during which he maintained a revised list of U.S. attorneys to be fired or retained. If prosecutors were placed on this list for political reasons, or alternatively kept off because of a willingness to engage in political prosecutions, these actions are not only improper and illegal, but they constitute criminal abuse. These are serious allegations, and we have a constitutional duty to pursue this proceeding today.

Congress is not only entitled to look into this matter, we must conduct a thorough oversight of the executive branch. Now, some of my colleagues argue that the United States attorneys serve at the pleasure of the President. However, it is very critical to note that throwing out this term, "at the pleasure of the President," may be accurate in the sense that the President may fire somebody for no reason, Alberto Gonzalez can fire somebody for no reason, but they can't fire him for an illegal reason.

And that is what we are looking at here. The Committee on the Judiciary Chairman CONYERS testified yesterday that he pursued documents from the White House and the testimony of Ms. Miers and from Mr. Bolton for 8 long months, and in return the White House did not provide a single document and specifically directed Ms. Miers and Mr. Bolton to ignore the Judiciary Committee's subpoenas citing executive privilege.

This is not a situation of exerting executive privilege, because Ms. Miers did not even show up for the hearings that they were called to testify before to assert that claim. Furthermore, Madam Speaker, it is one thing for them to decline to answer certain questions based on a claim of executive privilege; it is an entirely different matter to defy even orders to appear.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I continue to reserve, Madam Speaker.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. COHEN. I appreciate the time. I do serve on Judiciary Committee, and I looked at that empty chair that Ms. Miers was supposed to be sitting in when she was asked to testify before our committee.

Nothing is more contemptuous of an official than not to simply appear. To appear by counsel, to appear in person, to allege a privilege is one thing. Not to show up is the uttermost peak of contempt that a person could have for the Congress and for the legislative body. She didn't even send a little note, Ms. Miers regrettably cannot attend your hearing.

This is the highest contempt. We are representatives of the people, and we are upholding the Constitution and our jobs as being an equal branch of government, which this legislative body is, and there is no such thing as an imperial Presidency, and no one is above the law.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I continue to reserve.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER) from the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. WEXLER. Madam Speaker, no one is immune from accountability and the rule of law, not Harriet Miers or Josh Bolten, and especially not President Bush or Vice President CHENEY.

It is high time to defend the Constitution and Congress as a coequal branch of government. Our liberty and freedoms as Americans are dependent upon the checks and balances that protect our Nation. Not since Watergate, not since Watergate has a President so openly disregarded the will of Congress. Josh Bolten and Harriet Miers have blatantly ignored congressional subpoenas, thumbing their nose at Congress and our obligation of legitimate oversight.

The power of the congressional subpoena safeguards our liberty. It protects against an all-powerful President. The Constitution demands that we hold these renegade officials in contempt of Congress.

Thank you, Madam Chairman.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members that the wearing of communicative badges is not in order while under recognition.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle as Members of a coequal branch of government to issue these contempt citations to members of the Bush administration who

clearly feel that they are above the law.

Last year, when the Judiciary Committee was legitimately investigating the political purge of U.S. attorneys and conducting oversight into the politicization of the Justice Department, administration officials not only failed to turn over key documents after receiving subpoenas, they didn't even bother to show up to testify.

Madam Speaker, I am deeply frustrated by this administration's continued stonewalling and, frankly, the contempt that it has shown for Congress. As our former Republican colleague Congressman Mickey Edwards told our committee, the administration's actions have been outrageous and it continues to erode the separation of powers.

I applaud Chairman CONYERS' patience and his many attempts to resolve this situation short of the manner in which we will today, but I know I speak for many of my colleagues when I say enough is enough.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I would ask the distinguished chairwoman how many speakers she has remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I believe I have just one. And so I will yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleagues of the Judiciary Committee, and I thank my colleagues of the Rules Committee.

Madam Speaker, I stand on this floor with a very heavy heart. It is a heavy heart compounded by the fact that Harriet Miers is my friend. We practiced law together in the State of Texas. We worked together. And so it is very difficult to stand here today and to acknowledge what is an enormous crisis in our Government, and that is the lack of recognition of the constitutional premise of the three equal branches of Government. I came yesterday to talk of the embeddedness of the Constitution not only in many books but also in the hearts of Americans. When I go home to Texas, people still ask the question: What are you doing about the U.S. attorney situation? What happened to the fairness and integrity of the appointment process? The American people want to know. We are now doing their bidding. They want us to be able to clear the air.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, let me tell you, JOHN CONYERS has the patience of Job. Over and over again, and Chairwoman SANCHEZ, over and over again, working with Ranking Member CANNON, said that we wanted to do this in a way that you could come and give information, that information could be transcribed. We will then try to find out the truth.

We come here with a broken heart, a humble spirit, but with the Constitu-

tion deeply embedded in our heart, recognizing that there is nothing to protect if the President says that he is not involved.

Let the Constitution stand. Let us do what we are supposed to do. My friends, vote for this in a bipartisan way so that the Constitution remains sacred in our hearts and in this country.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 982, which provides that upon adoption of the rule, both H. Res. 979 recommending that the House of Representatives find former White House Counsel Harriet Miers and White House Chief of Staff Joshua Bolten in contempt of Congress for their refusal to comply with subpoenas issued by the Committee on the Judiciary and H. Res. 980—Authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to initiate or intervene in judicial proceedings to enforce certain subpoenas are adopted. Both of the resolutions were introduced by my distinguished colleague from Michigan, the Honorable JOHN CONYERS, Jr.

H. RES. 979

This resolution highlights the accountability issues that this body has continued to have with the Bush administration. This committee made attempt after attempt to secure critical information voluntarily from both former White House Counsel Harriet Miers and White House Chief of Staff Joshua Bolten. At no point did they cooperate and comply with our requests. Even as this committee directed their appearance by subpoena, the White House sought to avert our inquiries by citing executive privilege.

Instead, the White House offered this committee a very limited inquiry, completely controlled by providing: (1) virtually no access to internal White House documents, (2) no questioning regarding internal White House discussions, and (3) no interview transcripts. The White House is not bluffing with this act of defiance. Rather, it seems the Bush administration wants to test, and attempt to expand, the limits of presidential power.

Madam Speaker, it was on July 12, 2007 that Ms. Harriet Miers was asked to testify before the Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law investigating the removal of U.S. attorneys by the Bush administration, and did not attend. That same day, the subcommittee's Chair, the Honorable LINDA SANCHEZ, undertook the preliminary steps necessary to declare Miers in contempt. The subcommittee voted 7–5 that there was no legal justification for Ms. Miers's failing to appear pursuant to the subpoena.

Notwithstanding this blatant affront to the House Judiciary Committee, Republican Members allowed party affiliation to trump institutional responsibility, just as they had when they controlled Congress. The Minority continues to make excuses for the Bush administration's defiance, and appears content to let the President slight the subcommittee by instructing both Ms. Miers and Mr. Bolten to not testify.

H. RES. 980 AND CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT

Congressional oversight is an implied rather than an enumerated power. My colleagues across the aisle may make the argument that nothing explicitly grants this body the authority to conduct inquiries or investigations of the

Executive, to have access to records or materials held by the Executive, or to issue subpoenas for documents or testimony from the Executive.

However, congressional investigations sustain and vindicate our role in our constitutional scheme of separated powers. The rich history of congressional investigations from the failed St. Clair expedition in 1792 through Teapot Dome, Watergate, and Iran-Contra, has established, in law and practice, the nature and contours of congressional prerogatives necessary to maintain the integrity of the legislative role. Numerous Supreme Court precedents recognize a broad and encompassing power in this body to engage in oversight and investigation that would reach all sources of information necessary for carrying out its legislative function. Without a countervailing constitutional privilege or this body self-imposing a statutory restriction on our authority, this chamber, along with our colleagues in the Senate, have plenary power to compel information needed to discharge our legislative functions from the Executive, private individuals, and companies.

In *McGrain v. Daugherty*, 1927, the U.S. Supreme Court deemed the power of inquiry, with the accompanying process to enforce it, "an essential and appropriate auxiliary to the legislative function." Senate Rule XXVI, 26, and House Rule XI, 11, presently empower all standing committees and subcommittees to require the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of documents. This chamber was given an implied power of oversight by the U.S. Constitution; that power has supported by our 3rd branch of government, the Supreme Court; we ourselves have expressed this authority in our Senate and House Rules, and yet two attorneys under the direction of the White House continue to tell us we do not have the proper authority.

H.R. 5230, CONTEMPT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES SUBPOENA AUTHORITY ACT OF 2008 [110TH]

On February 6, I introduced legislation that would amend Title 28, of the United States Code and grant this chamber the statutory authority to bring a civil action to enforce and secure a declaratory judgment to prevent a threatened refusal or failure to comply with any subpoena or order for the production of documents, the answering of any deposition or interrogatory, or the securing of testimony issued by the House or any of its committees or subcommittees.

Once we pass H.R. 5230, we should have no further need to adopt resolutions for authorization to enforce certain subpoenas; we would already hold that statutory authority. As it stands now, we must collectively support both H. Res. 979 and H. Res. 980 under H. Res. 982, the adopted rule. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 982 an important piece of legislation that allows for not only accountability but enforcement.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I would ask the distinguished chairwoman if she has no other speakers, obviously besides herself.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. That's correct, if the gentleman is prepared to close.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Actually I will yield myself 2 minutes at this time.

The actions of the majority today are unprecedented. We have checked with

the House Parliamentarian, and they are absolutely and totally unprecedented, that privileged resolutions would be taken to the floor in this fashion, in effect, avoiding even the floor by virtue of the fact that when the rule is passed, the rule that we are debating, automatically the two privileged resolutions of contempt will be considered adopted. That is absolutely unprecedented as well as uncalled for.

And the nature of the actions of the majority today are most, most unfortunate. I had the recent opportunity to speak at Florida International University's law school. Professor Levitt asked me to speak there about the rule of law. In studying, restudying the issue, the rule of law, I stressed how the independence of the judiciary is perhaps the key, or certainly one of the fundamental keys, to the rule of law. And judicial restraint has permitted the judiciary to remain independent throughout these two-plus centuries. All of the branches, Madam Speaker, must exercise restraint.

And the actions of the majority today manifest the opposite, not only restraint, but I would say unprecedented, uncalled for, an unprecedented and uncalled for manner of dealing with even an issue of this importance.

As I stated, the majority is not even allowing debate on the resolutions of contempt, not even permitting votes on the resolutions of contempt.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 2, nays 400, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 59]

YEAS—2

Johnson (IL)

Young (AK)

NAYS—400

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin

Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)

Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany

Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxy
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey

Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herstein Sandlin
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Insee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Pitts
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Loftgren, Zoe
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCullum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern

McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Muggrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions

Sestak	Sutton	Wasserman
Shadegg	Tancredo	Schultz
Shays	Tanner	Waters
Shea-Porter	Tauscher	Watson
Sherman	Taylor	Watt
Shimkus	Terry	Waxman
Shuler	Thompson (CA)	Weiner
Shuster	Thompson (MS)	Welch (VT)
Simpson	Thornberry	Weldon (FL)
Sires	Tiahrt	Weller
Skelton	Tiberi	Westmoreland
Slaughter	Tsongas	Wexler
Smith (NE)	Turner	Whitfield (KY)
Smith (NJ)	Udall (CO)	Wilson (NM)
Smith (TX)	Udall (NM)	Wilson (OH)
Smith (WA)	Upton	Wilson (SC)
Snyder	Van Hollen	Wittman (VA)
Souder	Velázquez	Wolf
Space	Visclosky	Woolsey
Spratt	Walberg	Wu
Stark	Walden (OR)	Wynn
Stearns	Walsh (NY)	Yarmuth
Stupak	Walz (MN)	
Sullivan	Wamp	

NOT VOTING—26

Ackerman	Green, Gene	Markey
Brown, Corrine	Hill	Peterson (PA)
Costa	Hinchey	Renzi
DeGette	Honda	Ruppersberger
Dicks	Hunter	Solis
Edwards	Jones (OH)	Tierney
Engel	Kilpatrick	Towns
English (PA)	Lowey	Young (FL)
Frelinghuysen	Mahoney (FL)	

□ 1340

Mr. MCHUGH, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Messrs. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, HIGGINS, SESTAK, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. BERKLEY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 59, had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

Ms. SOLIS. Madam Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 59, on the motion to adjourn, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 2 minutes remaining; the gentlewoman from New York has 3½ minutes remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield the balance of our time to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Speaker and my colleagues, many of you have heard me say on numerous occasions that I think the American people sent us here to work together to get things done on behalf of our country.

Over the last couple of weeks, we have had an opportunity with the economic growth package to work in a bipartisan way on behalf of the American people, and I really think it showed our Chamber and our Congress at its best. But I don't think there is any priority that we have that is more important than protecting the American people.

For more than 6 months, we have reached out to the majority on the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act because we want to give our intelligence officials all the tools they need to protect us. That bill that was passed

in late July expired on February 1, and several weeks ago we provided an extension that runs out on Saturday. But for the last 6 months, as we have tried to come to an agreement on this bill, we have reached out to the majority, trying to find common ground, and we have been turned down at every turn.

This week, the President, the Senate, and, frankly, a majority of the Members of this House have said enough is enough, no more extensions. But instead of working with the Republicans and Democrats who are interested in working on this bill that would protect our country and protect the American people by passing the bipartisan Senate Foreign Intelligence Surveillance bill, the House floor is the scene of a partisan political stunt.

Yesterday, the majority leader said that this political stunt would occur today because we have space on the House schedule. In other words, we have space on the calendar today for a politically charged fishing expedition, but no space for a bill that would protect the American people from terrorists who want to kill us.

□ 1345

Madam Speaker, I think this is the height of irresponsibility. It is an insult to this House, and it is an insult to the American people. The actions on the floor of this House today will not make America safer. It will not help us protect Americans from being attacked.

Earlier today, the President announced that he would delay his trip to Africa, a long-planned trip. He would delay it so he could work with us to sign the long-term Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act modernization law into law. House Republicans stand ready to stay here as long as it takes to get this bill passed and get it to the President's desk.

Ladies and gentlemen, we will not stand here and watch this floor be abused for pure political grandstanding at the expense of our national security. We will not stand for this, and we will not stay for this. I would ask my House Republican colleagues and those who believe that we should be here protecting the American people not vote on this bill; let's just get up and leave.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, this is an interesting turn of events. They are apparently attaching no importance whatsoever to the Constitution of the United States. But that has not always been the case. I want to read to you a little from the debate in 1998 when Mr. BOEHNER speaks.

Mr. BOEHNER says: “Mr. Speaker, it is time for the stonewall tactics to end and the cooperating to begin. Whether it is stalling on basic requests for information or invoking executive privilege, the result is the same: the American people are denied the right to know what is going on inside their White House. In the end, Mr. Speaker, this is what this fight is about, the American people's right to know what happens in their government.

“The government does not belong to politicians in Washington, D.C. This government belongs to the American people, and they have a right to know what happens in Washington, D.C. They have a right to know what is going on in their White House.”

I concur completely with Mr. BOEHNER on that statement. I want neither Republican nor Democrat President to stonewall the House of Representatives or Congress.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the majority leader, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

The debates we have been having over the past few days are consequential and about the most important thing that this body does, and that is uphold the law. Not just pass the law, uphold the law.

As I said a little earlier in this debate, part of that was overseeing the executive branch to ensure that they execute our laws appropriately and legally. And the Congress has been given under the Constitution the authority to seek information. The Judiciary Committee has sought information and that information has not been forthcoming. The Congress, as Mr. BOEHNER said, cannot do its job if the Congress simply fails to assert its constitutional role.

Now there is a situation that we confront that a large number say they want to adjourn. They have been making motion after motion after motion to adjourn and they haven't been voting for it, but they have been making it.

And now they walk off the floor on the assertion that we are not working. They assert that we are not passing the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. They assert that, but they all voted to a person not to give us the time to perform our extraordinarily important duties in resolving the differences between the Senate and the House in a conference committee.

Now, I will tell my friends on the Republican side of the House, they know as well as I do that the reason the Senate did not pass us a bill 3 months after we passed our bill to them was because of Republican delay in the United States Senate. That's the reason this bill is so late getting to us. That is the reason we don't have the time to work it out. That is the reason we are not passing legislation.

Now, the President asserts that the expiration of the Protect America Act will pose a danger to our country. The former National Security Council Adviser on Terrorism says that is not true. Former Assistant Attorney General Wainstein says that is not true. Numerous others, and the chairman, have asserted that is not true. Why is it not true? Because FISA will remain in effect.

The authority given under the Protect America Act remains in effect. And if there are new targets, a FISA

Court has full authority to give every authority to the administration to act.

So I tell my friends, we are pursuing the politics of fear, unfounded fear; 435 Members of this House, and every one of us, every one of us, wants to keep America and Americans safe. Not one of us wants to subject America or Americans to danger.

The President's assertion is wrong. I say it categorically: the President's assertion is wrong. Now the President says he will delay his trip to stay here and work with us. I know Mr. REYES and Mr. CONYERS will be contacting Mr. ROCKEFELLER and Mr. LEAHY to discuss with them how we might move forward. They in turn will talk with their Republican counterparts, as well, to see how we can move forward.

But the time that we asked for, less than 24 hours after the Senate passed us a bill, the time we asked for to elect this process, which is the normal legislative process to bring the Senate and the House together to fashion a bill that both Houses feel comfortable with, feel is good for America, was denied to us yesterday by unanimous vote by the minority party and gave us no time to accomplish that objective.

The President said he was going to veto it, which is why I presume all of you voted against it, because, of course, in the first 6 years, we never passed anything to the President that he wasn't supportive of. We were a very cooperative Congress with this President. This President is not used to the Congress saying, We may have a different view, Mr. President. We, too, have a responsibility and we may see it slightly differently than you.

But, yes, as the leader on the other side said, we have come together. We worked together. We passed a stimulus package together. We can do that on this bill. But we can't do it overnight. This matter is much too serious to do it overnight.

My friend from the Rules Committee indicates that this does not give us full time for debate on this rule. He opposes this rule. The interesting thing is he says contrary, we ought to be considering something overnight, overnight, without any time to consider it in conference.

The minority has now effected a strategy that they tried to use on the agriculture bill: let's work, but by the way, we are leaving. And why are we leaving? We are leaving so we can preclude a majority responding to a quorum call and if a majority does not respond, we will have to go out of session. So it is somewhat ironic that on the one hand they say we ought to be doing something, and on the other hand they walk out to preclude us from doing our business.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I simply rise to say that my very good friend, the distinguished gentleman

from Maryland, is incorrect when he said that we are asking for a measure to be considered overnight. On Tuesday of this week, this measure was sent to this House. We have had an opportunity, as we have looked at the issue of FISA modernization since July of this past year to get it done, and there is an urgency at this moment. So it has not been overnight.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comment. There is no urgency. That claim is a claim made to stampede this House and the American people, I tell my friend from California. And the reason that there is no urgency is because in 1978 this Congress passed legislation to ensure the fact that we could intercept communications while at the same time protecting our Constitution. That is why there is no urgency.

Is there an important reason to act? There is. Do we have every intention of acting? We do. But we will not be presented with a bill on Tuesday night and be asked to pass it on Wednesday afternoon without full and fair consideration. That is our duty, that is our responsibility, and that is what we will do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 minute.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I began my speech today by saying we must not always live our lives hoping simply to land on a safe square. Some votes may be tough. This one isn't. The first thing we do when we enter this Congress is swear to uphold the Constitution of the United States. That is what we are asking you to do today on both sides of the aisle. For some of our friends, it is obviously easier for them to pass; they would rather not vote on this. But for the rest of us, let us stand up to our duty, why we were sent here, and reassert that the Congress of the United States is a co-equal branch, and vote "yes" on this.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the contempt resolutions. Unfortunately, these resolutions are necessary for Congress to meet its Constitutional obligations and conduct oversight and investigations. We provided many opportunities for the administration to avoid this situation. But here we are.

We are here today to consider issuing contempt citations for former White House Counsel Harriet Miers and White House Chief of Staff Josh Bolten for their failure even to appear in response to valid subpoenas issued in our investigation of the firings of a number of United States Attorneys and related matters concerning the politicization of the Justice Department. We issued these subpoenas only after repeated unsuccessful attempts to secure their cooperation voluntarily.

It is one thing to assert a legal privilege; but no one has a legal right simply to refuse to appear at all.

This investigation seeks answers to ensure that the American people can trust the Justice Department to be guided by the law and not by political obligations or pressures.

This resolution is about the rule of law. We are taught about a system of checks and bal-

ances to prevent abuses, but this Executive has shown that it thinks the rules do not apply to it. This sets a dangerous precedent for our democracy. Our system of government works only when each branch respects the authority and role of the others, and follows the rule of law.

For the sake of our democracy, for the sake of the rule of law, and for the sake of our Constitution, I urge my colleagues to support the resolutions.

Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN. Madam Speaker, I plan to vote in favor of this resolution—first and foremost—because of the essential importance of maintaining the constitutional role of the Congress as a coequal branch of government with the executive. However, the partisan division over this resolution is highly regrettable and serves to obscure the vital principles at stake.

As my colleagues are well aware, the House Judiciary Committee has initiated an inquiry into the unusual firing of several U.S. Attorneys. The impartial administration of federal law around the nation depends upon the integrity of the U.S. Department of Justice and the U.S. Attorneys. The decisions of the department and the officials who implement its vast legal authority should be free of even the appearance of impropriety, and free of politics. This is true under any administration, regardless of party.

The importance of the committee's inquiry into this matter is clear. In order to secure the facts necessary to make an informed judgment regarding the propriety of those firings, the committee first sought the voluntary cooperation of the administration in producing all of the information the committee needed to form a fair assessment. When that cooperation was not forthcoming, subpoenas were duly issued to Chief of Staff Joshua Bolten and former White House counsel Harriet Miers. On the basis of an assertion of executive privilege, neither complied with the subpoenas. In the face of the White House's inflexibility and refusal to cooperate, the committee ultimately voted to approve a contempt citation and bring the matter before the House.

I still believe that focusing on civil proceedings as a way to resolve the dispute could have garnered bipartisan support, and thereby avoided much of the partisan division we have witnessed regarding this resolution. However, that is not the choice before the House today. We must choose between recognizing and supporting the constitutional role of Congress, or allowing the administration to direct officials and former officials to ignore an important inquiry under way in the House.

At this crucial moment in our nation's history, it's more important than ever to maintain the balance of powers between the federal government's executive and legislative branches. That balance was carefully designed by the Founders, and we have consistently seen through the years the wisdom of that arrangement. Over the last several years, we witnessed first-hand the unfortunate and regrettable consequences when that balance was disturbed, and Congress failed to carry out its oversight responsibilities. The American people deserve better.

Thus, I cast my vote today not only to support the centuries-old role of the House under the Constitution, but for greater transparency, greater accountability, and to ensure the fair administration of federal law. Once the facts

are known, the House can make an informed judgment about what course of action is best. Until we learn what the administration knows, but isn't willing to share with the Congress, we cannot form a final judgment in this matter.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Speaker, I regret that it is necessary for the House to consider this matter today, but I will support the resolution because I have concluded that the Bush administration has made it necessary to do so. When this is disposed of, I hope we can promptly return to the pressing needs of the American people that Congress needs to address.

Last year, the Judiciary Committee began reviewing the actions of the administration related to the firings of a number of U.S. Attorneys and allegations that this was part of a pattern of improper politicization of the Justice Department.

After failing to get requested information voluntarily, the Committee served subpoenas on then-White House Counsel Harriet Miers and Chief of Staff Josh Bolten. The president then invoked executive privilege and Ms. Miers and Mr. Bolten, despite the subpoenas, refused to appear before the Committee. In response, the Judiciary Committee approved a resolution citing them both for contempt of the Congress.

I am not a lawyer and certainly not an expert on questions of executive privilege. But it seems clear to me that the administration has refused to negotiate in good faith to resolve this matter, offering only to allow some interviews under severe restrictions, including a bar to keeping of transcripts.

This is not the first time Congress has sought information from a president's advisors. The Congressional Research Service reports there have been 74 instances since World War II where even sitting White House advisors, including White House counsel, have testified before Congress, including 17 between 1996 and 2001. But I am not aware of any instance in which executive privilege has been invoked as a reason why a former advisor—such as Ms. Miers—will not even make an appearance before a Congressional committee in response to a subpoena.

And I am not persuaded by the administration's explanations about why it refused to allow Ms. Miers and Mr. Bolten to even appear, let alone to testify. For example, we have been assured that the President was not involved in the decision to fire the U.S. Attorneys. But if that is true, how can executive privilege, which is intended to assure that a president will receive candid advice, apply to this matter?

After reviewing the history of this matter, I find myself in agreement with someone who is both a lawyer and a distinguished former Member of Congress—Mickey Edwards, who during his service here as a Representative from Oklahoma chaired the Republican Policy Committee.

Commenting on this matter, he has written, "If Congressional leaders are not able to persuade the administration to reverse its position and allow Ms. Miers to testify and Mr. Bolten to produce documents, then all Members of Congress, regardless of party, should insist that the subpoenas be enforced promptly and vigorously and to use civil litigation if, as the White House has hinted, it prohibits the D.C. U.S. Attorney from performing his enforcement duties."

I agree, and because that is exactly the purpose of this resolution, I will vote for it.

The material previously referred to by Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 982 OFFERED BY MR. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART OF FLORIDA

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert the following:

"That upon adoption of this resolution, before consideration of any order of business other than one motion that the House adjourn, the bill (H.R. 3773) to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to establish a procedure for authorizing certain acquisitions of foreign intelligence, and for other purposes, with Senate amendment thereto, shall be considered to have been taken from the Speaker's table. A motion that the House concur in the Senate amendment shall be considered as pending in the House without intervention of any point of order. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their designees. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to final adoption without intervening motion.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives*, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the *Floor Procedures Manual* published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's "American Congressional Dictionary": "If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually

the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business."

Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 223, noes 32, answered "present" 1, not voting 173, as follows:

[Roll No. 60]

AYES—223

Abercrombie	Cramer	Hinchey
Allen	Crowley	Hinojosa
Altmire	Cummings	Hirono
Andrews	Davis (AL)	Hodes
Arcuri	Davis (CA)	Holden
Baca	Davis (IL)	Holt
Baird	Davis, Lincoln	Hooley
Baldwin	DeFazio	Hoyer
Barrow	DeGette	Inlee
Bean	Delahunt	Israel
Becerra	DeLauro	Jackson (IL)
Berkley	Dicks	Jackson-Lee
Berman	Dingell	(TX)
Berry	Doggett	Jefferson
Bishop (GA)	Donnelly	Johnson (GA)
Bishop (NY)	Doyle	Johnson, E. B.
Blumenauer	Edwards	Jones (NC)
Boren	Ellison	Kagen
Boswell	Ellsworth	Kanjorski
Boucher	Emanuel	Kaptur
Boyd (FL)	Eshoo	Kennedy
Boyda (KS)	Etheridge	Kildee
Brady (PA)	Farr	Kilpatrick
Braley (IA)	Fattah	Kind
Butterfield	Filner	Klein (FL)
Capps	Frank (MA)	Kucinich
Capuano	Giffords	Lampson
Cardoza	Gilchrest	Langevin
Carnahan	Gillibrand	Larsen (WA)
Carney	Gonzalez	Larson (CT)
Castor	Gordon	Lee
Chandler	Green, Al	Levin
Clarke	Green, Gene	Lewis (GA)
Clay	Grijalva	Lipinski
Cleaver	Gutierrez	Loebuck
Clyburn	Hall (NY)	Lofgren, Zoe
Cohen	Hare	Lynch
Conyers	Harman	Mahoney (FL)
Cooper	Hastings (FL)	Maloney (NY)
Costa	Herseth Sandlin	Markey
Costello	Higgins	Marshall
Courtney	Hill	Matheson

Matsui	Perlmutter	Space
McCarthy (NY)	Peterson (MN)	Spratt
McCollum (MN)	Pomeroy	Stark
McDermott	Price (NC)	Stupak
McGovern	Rahall	Sutton
McIntyre	Rangel	Tanner
McNerney	Reyes	Tauscher
McNulty	Richardson	Taylor
Meek (FL)	Rodriguez	Thompson (CA)
Meeks (NY)	Ross	Thompson (MS)
Melancon	Rothman	Tierney
Michaud	Roybal-Allard	Tsongas
Miller (NC)	Rush	Udall (CO)
Miller, George	Ryan (OH)	Udall (NM)
Mitchell	Salazar	Van Hollen
Mollohan	Sánchez, Linda	Velázquez
Moore (KS)	T.	Visclosky
Moore (WI)	Sanchez, Loretta	Walz (MN)
Moran (VA)	Sarbanes	Wasserman
Murphy (CT)	Schakowsky	Schultz
Murphy, Patrick	Schiff	Waters
Murtha	Schwartz	Watson
Nadler	Scott (GA)	Watt
Napolitano	Scott (VA)	Waxman
Oberstar	Serrano	Weiner
Obey	Sestak	Welch (VT)
Oliver	Shea-Porter	Wexler
Ortiz	Sherman	Wilson (OH)
Pallone	Shuler	Woolsey
Pascarell	Sires	Wu
Pastor	Skelton	Wynn
Paul	Slaughter	Yarmuth
Payne	Smith (WA)	
Pelosi	Snyder	

NOES—32

Aderholt	Fossella	LoBiondo
Brown (SC)	Fox	McHugh
Burton (IN)	Gallegly	Miller, Gary
Camp (MI)	Hall (TX)	Moran (KS)
Conaway	Hoekstra	Poe
Cubin	Johnson (IL)	Ramstad
Cuellar	King (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Davis, David	Kirk	Simpson
Davis, Tom	Kuhl (NY)	Weller
Duncan	LaHood	Wittman (VA)
Ehlers	Latham	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Porter

NOT VOTING—173

Ackerman	Emerson	Lungren, Daniel
Akin	Engel	E.
Alexander	English (PA)	Mack
Bachmann	Everett	Manzullo
Bachus	Fallin	Marchant
Barrett (SC)	Feeney	McCarthy (CA)
Bartlett (MD)	Ferguson	McCaul (TX)
Barton (TX)	Flake	McCotter
Biggert	Forbes	McCrery
Billbray	Fortenberry	McHenry
Bilirakis	Franks (AZ)	McKeon
Bishop (UT)	Frelinghuysen	McMorris
Blackburn	Garrett (NJ)	Rodgers
Blunt	Gerlach	Mica
Boehner	Gingrey	Miller (FL)
Bonner	Gohmert	Miller (MI)
Bono Mack	Goode	Murphy, Tim
Boozman	Goodlatte	Musgrave
Boustany	Granger	Myrick
Brady (TX)	Graves	Neal (MA)
Brown (GA)	Hastings (WA)	Neugebauer
Brown, Corrine	Hayes	Nunes
Brown-Waite,	Heller	Pearce
Ginny	Hensarling	Pence
Buchanan	Herger	Peterson (PA)
Burgess	Hobson	Petri
Buyer	Honda	Pickering
Calvert	Hulshof	Pitts
Campbell (CA)	Hunter	Platts
Cannon	Inglis (SC)	Price (GA)
Cantor	Issa	Pryce (OH)
Capito	Johnson, Sam	Putnam
Carter	Jones (OH)	Radanovich
Castle	Jordan	Regula
Chabot	Keller	Rehberg
Coble	King (IA)	Reichert
Cole (OK)	Kingston	Renzi
Crenshaw	Kline (MN)	Reynolds
Culberson	Knollenberg	Rogers (AL)
Davis (KY)	Lamborn	Rogers (KY)
Deal (GA)	LaTourette	Rogers (MI)
Dent	Latta	Rohrabacher
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lewis (CA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lewis (KY)	Roskam
Doolittle	Linder	Royce
Drake	Lowey	Ruppersberger
Dreier	Lucas	Ryan (WI)

Sali	Souder	Walden (OR)
Saxton	Stearns	Walsh (NY)
Schmidt	Sullivan	Wamp
Sessions	Tancredo	Weldon (FL)
Shadegg	Terry	Westmoreland
Shays	Thornberry	Whitfield (KY)
Shimkus	Tiahrt	Wilson (NM)
Shuster	Tiberi	Wilson (SC)
Taylor	Towns	Wolf
Smith (NE)	Turner	Young (AK)
Smith (NJ)	Upton	Young (FL)
Smith (TX)	Walberg	
Solis		

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 4 minutes remaining to vote.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining on this vote.

□ 1423

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. SOLIS. Madam Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 60 on H. Res. 982, Contempt on Miers and Bolten, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. By the adoption of House Resolution 982, House Resolution 979 and House Resolution 980 stand adopted.

The text of House Resolution 979 is as follows:

H. RES. 979

Resolved, That pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 192 and 194, the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall certify the report of the Committee on the Judiciary, detailing the refusal of former White House Counsel Harriet Miers to appear before the Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law as directed by subpoena, to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that Ms. Miers be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law; and be it further

Resolved, That pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 192 and 194, the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall certify the report of the Committee on the Judiciary, detailing the refusal of former White House Counsel Harriet Miers to testify before the Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law as directed by subpoena, to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that Ms. Miers be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law; and be it further

Resolved, That pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 192 and 194, the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall certify the report of the Committee on the Judiciary, detailing the refusal of former White House Counsel Harriet Miers to produce documents to the Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law as directed by subpoena, to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that Ms. Miers be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law; and be it further

Resolved, That pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 192 and 194, the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall certify the report of the Committee on the Judiciary, detailing the refusal of White House Chief of Staff Joshua

Bolten to produce documents to the Committee on the Judiciary as directed by subpoena, to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that Mr. Bolten be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

The text of House Resolution 980 is as follows:

H. RES. 980

Resolved, That the Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to initiate or intervene in judicial proceedings in any Federal court of competent jurisdiction, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, to seek declaratory judgments affirming the duty of any individual to comply with any subpoena that is a subject of House Resolution 979 issued to such individual by the Committee as part of its investigation into the firing of certain United States Attorneys and related matters, and to seek appropriate ancillary relief, including injunctive relief.

SEC. 2. The Committee on the Judiciary shall report as soon as practicable to the House with respect to any judicial proceedings which it initiates or in which it intervenes pursuant to this resolution.

SEC. 3. The Office of General Counsel of the House of Representatives shall, at the authorization of the Speaker, represent the Committee on the Judiciary in any litigation pursuant to this resolution. In giving that authorization, the Speaker shall consult with the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group established pursuant to clause 8 of Rule II.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Res. 966, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 1834, by the yeas and nays;

S. 2571, by the yeas and nays;

H. Con. Res. 289, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 4169, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 790, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 963, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 972, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

HONORING AFRICAN AMERICAN INVENTORS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 966, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 966.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 387, nays 0, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 61]

YEAS—387

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.

Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxy
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseht Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk

Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lucas
Lungrén, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel

Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions

Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skeltton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Tsongas

Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—41

Ackerman
Alexander
Bachus
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brown, Corrine
Burgess
Capito
Cole (OK)
Deal (GA)
Doolittle
Drake
Emerson
Engel

Feeney
Hayes
Honda
Jones (OH)
King (IA)
LaTourette
Lowey
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Markey
McCrery
McMorris
Rodgers
Myrick

Neal (MA)
Oliver
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Price (NC)
Reichert
Rogers (KY)
Ruppersberger
Solis
Stark
Sullivan
Townsend
Visclosky
Westmoreland

□ 1443

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 14, 2008, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote No. 61. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" (on motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Res. 966, honoring African American inventors, past and present, for their leadership, courage, and significant contributions to our national competitiveness).

Ms. SOLIS. Madam Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 61 on motion to suspend and pass H.R. 966, honoring African-American Inventors, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

NATIONAL OCEAN EXPLORATION PROGRAM ACT

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill (H.R. 1834) to authorize the national ocean exploration program and the national undersea research program within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, as proposed to be adopted under suspension of the rules, be modified by the amendment that I have placed at the desk.

(For the text of H.R. 1834, see proceedings of the House of February 13, 2008, at page H896.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

TITLE I—NATIONAL OCEAN EXPLORATION PROGRAM

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "National Ocean Exploration Program Act".

SEC. 102. AUTHORIZATION.

The Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shall, in consultation with the National Science Foundation and other appropriate Federal agencies, conduct a coordinated national ocean exploration program within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration that promotes collaboration with other Federal ocean and undersea research and exploration programs. To the extent appropriate, the Administrator shall seek to facilitate coordination of data and information management systems, outreach and education programs to improve public understanding of ocean and coastal resources, and development and transfer of technologies to facilitate ocean and undersea research and exploration.

SEC. 103. AUTHORITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the program authorized under section 102, the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (in this title referred to as the "Administrator") shall—

(1) conduct interdisciplinary voyages or other scientific activities of discovery in conjunction with other Federal agencies or academic or educational institutions, to explore and survey little known areas of the marine environment, inventory, observe, and assess living and nonliving marine resources, and report such findings;

(2) give priority attention to deep ocean regions, with a focus on deep water marine systems that hold potential for important scientific discoveries, such as hydrothermal vent communities and seamounts;

(3) conduct scientific voyages to locate, define, and document historic shipwrecks, submerged sites, and other ocean exploration activities that combine archaeology and oceanographic sciences;

(4) develop and implement, in consultation with the National Science Foundation, a transparent, competitive process for merit-based peer-review and approval of proposals for activities to be conducted under this program, taking into consideration advice of the Board established under section 104;

(5) enhance the technical capability of the United States marine science community by promoting the development of improved oceanographic research, communication, navigation, and data collection systems, as well as underwater platforms and sensors and autonomous vehicles; and

(6) establish an ocean exploration forum to encourage partnerships and promote communication among experts and other stakeholders in order to enhance the scientific and technical expertise and relevance of the national program.

(b) DONATIONS.—In carrying out the program authorized under section 102, the Administrator may accept donations of property, data, and equipment to be applied for the purpose of exploring the oceans or increasing knowledge of the oceans.

SEC. 104. OCEAN EXPLORATION ADVISORY BOARD.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Administrator shall appoint an Ocean Exploration Advisory

Board composed of experts in relevant fields to—

(1) advise the Administrator on priority areas for survey and discovery;

(2) assist the program in the development of a five-year strategic plan for the fields of ocean, marine, and Great Lakes science, exploration, and discovery;

(3) annually review the quality and effectiveness of the proposal review process established under section 103(4); and

(4) provide other assistance and advice as requested by the Administrator.

(b) **FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.**—Section 14 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Board appointed under subsection (a).

SEC. 105. APPLICATION WITH OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LANDS ACT.

Nothing in this Act supersedes, or limits the authority of the Secretary of the Interior under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.).

SEC. 106. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out this title—

- (1) \$30,500,000 for fiscal year 2008;
- (2) \$33,550,000 for fiscal year 2009;
- (3) \$36,905,000 for fiscal year 2010;
- (4) \$40,596,000 for fiscal year 2011;
- (5) \$44,655,000 for fiscal year 2012;
- (6) \$49,121,000 for fiscal year 2013; and
- (7) \$54,033,000 for fiscal year 2014.

TITLE II—UNDERSEA RESEARCH PROGRAM

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “National Undersea Research Program Act of 2007”.

SEC. 202. AUTHORIZATION.

The Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shall conduct an undersea research, exploration, education, and technology development program and shall designate a Director of that program.

SEC. 203. PURPOSE.

The purpose of the program authorized under section 202 is to increase scientific knowledge essential for the informed management, use, and preservation of oceanic, marine, coastal, and Great Lakes resources. The Director, in carrying out the program authorized in section 202, shall cooperate with institutions of higher education and other educational marine and ocean science organizations, and shall make available undersea research facilities, equipment, technologies, information, and expertise to support undersea research efforts by these organizations. The Director may also enter into partnerships, using existing authorities, with the private sector to achieve the goals of the program and to promote technological advancement of the marine industry.

SEC. 204. PROGRAM.

The program authorized under section 202 shall be conducted through a national headquarters, a network of extramural regional undersea research centers that represent all relevant National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration regions, and the National Institute for Undersea Science and Technology. Overall direction of the program will be developed by the program director with a Council of Center Directors comprised of the directors of the extramural regional centers and the National Institute for Undersea Science and Technology. Draft program direction shall be published not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act. The draft program direction shall be published in the Federal Register for a public comment period of not less than 120 days. Final program direction with Agency responses to the comments received shall be

published in the Federal Register within 90 days after the close of the comment period. The program director shall update the program direction, with opportunity for public comment, at least every five years.

SEC. 205. REGIONAL CENTERS AND INSTITUTE.

(a) **PROGRAMS.**—The following research, exploration, education, and technology programs shall be conducted through the network of extramural regional centers and the National Institute for Undersea Science and Technology:

(1) Core research and exploration based on national and regional undersea research priorities.

(2) Advanced undersea technology development to support the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s research mission and programs.

(3) Development, testing, and transition of advanced undersea technology associated with ocean observatories, submersibles, advanced diving technologies, remotely operated vehicles, autonomous underwater vehicles, and new sampling and sensing technologies.

(4) Undersea science-based education and outreach programs to enrich ocean science education and public awareness of the oceans and Great Lakes.

(5) Discovery, study, and development of natural products from ocean and aquatic systems.

(b) **OPERATIONS.**—Operation of the extramural regional centers and the National Institute for Undersea Science and Technology shall leverage partnerships and cooperative research with academia and private industry.

SEC. 206. COMPETITION.

(a) **DISCRETIONARY FUND.**—The program shall allocate no more than 10 percent of its annual budget to a discretionary fund that may be used only for program administration and priority undersea research projects identified by the Director but not covered by funding available from centers.

(b) **COMPETITIVE SELECTION.**—The Administrator shall conduct an initial competition to select the regional centers that will participate in the program 90 days after the publication of the final program direction required in section 204 and every five years thereafter. Funding for projects conducted through the regional centers shall be awarded through a competitive, merit-reviewed process on the basis of their relevance to the goals of the program and their technical feasibility.

SEC. 207. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out this title—

- (1) \$17,500,000 for fiscal year 2008;
- (2) \$19,500,000 for fiscal year 2009;
- (3) \$21,500,000 for fiscal year 2010;
- (4) \$23,500,000 for fiscal year 2011;
- (5) \$25,500,000 for fiscal year 2012;
- (6) \$27,500,000 for fiscal year 2013; and
- (7) \$29,500,000 for fiscal year 2014.

TITLE III—INTERAGENCY PLANNING AND COORDINATION

SEC. 301. OCEAN EXPLORATION AND UNDERSEA RESEARCH TECHNOLOGY AND INFRASTRUCTURE TASK FORCE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, in coordination with the National Science Foundation, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the United States Geological Survey, the Department of the Navy, the Mineral Management Service, and relevant governmental, non-governmental, academic, industry, and other experts, shall convene an ocean exploration and undersea research technology and infrastructure task force to develop and implement a strategy—

(1) to facilitate transfer of new exploration and undersea research technology to the programs authorized under titles I and II of this Act;

(2) to improve availability of communications infrastructure, including satellite capabilities, to such programs;

(3) to develop an integrated, workable, and comprehensive data management information processing system that will make information on unique and significant features obtained by such programs available for research and management purposes;

(4) to conduct public outreach activities that improve the public understanding of ocean science, resources, and processes, in conjunction with relevant programs of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the National Science Foundation, and other agencies; and

(5) to encourage cost-sharing partnerships with governmental and nongovernmental entities that will assist in transferring exploration and undersea research technology and technical expertise to the programs.

(b) **BUDGET COORDINATION.**—The task force shall coordinate the development of agency budgets and identify the items in their annual budget that support the activities identified in the strategy developed under subsection (a).

Mr. BAIRD (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the original request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

NATIONAL OCEAN EXPLORATION PROGRAM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1834, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1834, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 352, nays 49, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 62]

YEAS—352

Abercrombie	Baca	Bean
Aderholt	Bachmann	Becerra
Akin	Bachus	Berkley
Alexander	Baird	Berman
Allen	Baldwin	Berry
Altmire	Barrow	Biggert
Andrews	Bartlett (MD)	Bilbray
Arcuri	Barton (TX)	Bilirakis

Bishop (NY)	Gordon	McNerney	Terry	Walsh (NY)	Wexler	[Roll No. 63] YEAS—400	
Blumenauer	Granger	McNulty	Thompson (CA)	Walz (MN)	Whitfield (KY)		
Blunt	Graves	Meek (FL)	Thompson (MS)	Wamp	Wilson (NM)		
Bonner	Green, Al	Meeks (NY)	Tiberi	Wasserman	Wilson (OH)	Abercrombie	Dent
Bono Mack	Green, Gene	Melancon	Tierney	Schultz	Wittman (VA)	Aderholt	Diaz-Balart, L.
Boozman	Grijalva	Mica	Tsongas	Waters	Wolf	Akin	Diaz-Balart, M.
Boren	Gutierrez	Michaud	Turner	Watson	Woolsey	Alexander	Dicks
Boswell	Hall (NY)	Miller (MI)	Udall (NM)	Watt	Wu	Allen	Dingell
Boucher	Hall (TX)	Miller, Gary	Upton	Waxman	Yarmuth	Altmire	Doggett
Boustany	Hare	Miller, George	Van Hollen	Weiner	Young (AK)	Andrews	Donnelly
Boyd (FL)	Harman	Mitchell	Velázquez	Welch (VT)	Young (FL)	Arcuri	Doolittle
Boyd (KS)	Hastings (FL)	Mollohan	Visclosky	Weldon (FL)		Baca	Doyle
Brady (PA)	Heller	Moore (KS)	Walden (OR)	Weller		Bachmann	Dreier
Brady (TX)	Herger	Moore (WI)				Bachus	Duncan
Braley (IA)	Herseth Sandlin	Moran (VA)				Baird	Edwards
Brown (SC)	Higgins	Murphy (CT)	Barrett (SC)	Hensarling	Radanovich	Baldwin	Ehlers
Brown-Waite,	Hill	Murphy, Patrick	Blackburn	Johnson, Sam	Royce	Barrett (SC)	Ellison
Ginny	Hinchey	Murphy, Tim	Broun (GA)	Jordan	Ryan (WI)	Barrow	Ellsworth
Buchanan	Hinojosa	Murtha	Campbell (CA)	Kingston	Sali	Bartlett (MD)	Emanuel
Burton (IN)	Hirono	Musgrave	Cantor	Lamborn	Sensenbrenner	Barton (TX)	Emerson
Butterfield	Hobson	Nadler	Carter	Latta	Sessions	Bean	English (PA)
Buyer	Hodes	Napolitano	Conaway	Manzullo	Shadegg	Becerra	Etheridge
Calvert	Hoekstra	Oberstar	Culberson	Marchant	Shuster	Berkley	Everett
Camp (MI)	Holden	Obey	Doolittle	Miller (FL)	Stearns	Berman	Fallin
Cannon	Holt	Oliver	Duncan	Moran (KS)	Sullivan	Berry	Farr
Capito	Hooley	Ortiz	Flake	Myrick	Tancredo	Biggart	Fattah
Capps	Hoyer	Pallone	Fox	Neugebauer	Thornberry	Billbray	Ferguson
Cardoza	Hulshof	Pascarell	Franks (AZ)	Nunes	Tiahrt	Bilirakis	Filner
Carnahan	Hunter	Pastor	Garrett (NJ)	Paul	Walberg	Bishop (GA)	Flake
Carney	Inglis (SC)	Payne	Gingrey	Pence	Wilson (SC)	Bishop (NY)	Forbes
Castle	Inslee	Pearce	Gohmert	Petri		Blackburn	Fortenberry
Castor	Israel	Perlmutter	Hastings (WA)	Poe		Blumenauer	Fossella
Chabot	Issa	Peterson (MN)				Blunt	Fox
Chandler	Jackson (IL)	Pickering	Ackerman	Drake	Peterson (PA)	Boehner	Frank (MA)
Clarke	Jackson-Lee	Pitts	Bishop (GA)	Engel	Pryce (OH)	Bonner	Franks (AZ)
Clay	(TX)	Platts	Bishop (UT)	Feeney	Ruppersberger	Bono Mack	Frelinghuysen
Cleaver	Jefferson	Pomeroy	Boehner	Hayes	Slaughter	Boozman	Gallegly
Clyburn	Johnson (GA)	Porter	Brown, Corrine	Honda	Solis	Boren	Garrett (NJ)
Coble	Johnson (IL)	Price (GA)	Burgess	Jones (OH)	Towns	Boswell	Gerlach
Cohen	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)	Capuano	Lowe	Udall (CO)	Boucher	Giffords
Cole (OK)	Jones (NC)	Putnam	Conyers	Miller (NC)	Westmoreland	Boustany	Gilchrest
Cooper	Kagen	Rahall	Deal (GA)	Neal (MA)	Wynn	Boyd (FL)	Gillibrand
Costa	Kanjorski	Ramstad				Boyd (KS)	Gingrey
Costello	Kaptur	Rangel				Brady (PA)	Gohmert
Courtney	Keller	Regula				Brady (TX)	Gonzalez
Cramer	Kennedy	Rehberg				Braley (IA)	Goode
Crenshaw	Kildee	Reichert				Broun (GA)	Goodlatte
Crowley	Kilpatrick	Renzi				Brown (SC)	Gordon
Cubin	Kind	Reyes				Brown-Waite,	Graves
Cuellar	King (IA)	Reynolds				Ginny	Green, Al
Cummings	King (NY)	Richardson				Buchanan	Green, Gene
Davis (AL)	Kirk	Rodriguez				Burton (IN)	Grijalva
Davis (CA)	Klein (FL)	Rogers (AL)				Butterfield	Gutierrez
Davis (IL)	Kline (MN)	Rogers (KY)				Buyer	Hall (NY)
Davis (KY)	Knollenberg	Rogers (MI)				Calvert	Hall (TX)
Davis, David	Kucinich	Rohrabacher				Camp (MI)	Hare
Davis, Lincoln	Kuhl (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen				Campbell (CA)	Harman
Davis, Tom	LaHood	Roskam				Cannon	Hastings (FL)
DeFazio	Lampson	Ross				Cantor	Hastings (WA)
DeGette	Langevin	Rothman				Capito	Heller
Delahunt	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard				Capps	Hensarling
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Rush				Cardoza	Herger
Dent	Latham	Ryan (OH)				Carnahan	Herseth Sandlin
Diaz-Balart, L.	LaTourette	Salazar				Carney	Higgins
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lee	Sánchez, Linda				Carter	Hill
Dicks	Levin	T.				Castle	Hinchey
Dingell	Lewis (CA)	Sanchez, Loretta				Castor	Hirono
Doggett	Lewis (GA)	Sarbanoes				Chabot	Hobson
Donnelly	Lewis (KY)	Saxton				Chandler	Hodes
Doyle	Linder	Schakowsky				Clarke	Hoekstra
Dreier	Lipinski	Schiff				Clay	Holden
Edwards	LoBiondo	Schmidt				Cleaver	Holt
Ehlers	Loeb sack	Schwartz				Clyburn	Hooley
Ellison	Lofgren, Zoe	Scott (GA)				Coble	Hoyer
Ellsworth	Lucas	Scott (VA)				Cohen	Hulshof
Emanuel	Lungren, Daniel	Serrano				Cole (OK)	Hunter
Emerson	E.	Sestak				Conaway	Inglis (SC)
English (PA)	Lynch	Shays				Cooper	Inslee
Eshoo	Mack	Shea-Porter				Costa	Israel
Etheridge	Mahoney (FL)	Sherman				Costello	Issa
Everett	Maloney (NY)	Shimkus				Courtney	Jackson (IL)
Fallin	Markey	Shuler				Cramer	Jackson-Lee
Farr	Marshall	Simpson				Crenshaw	(TX)
Fattah	Matheson	Sires				Crowley	Jefferson
Ferguson	Matsui	Skelton				Cubin	Johnson (GA)
Filner	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (NE)				Cuellar	Johnson (IL)
Forbes	McCarthy (NY)	Smith (NJ)				Culberson	Johnson, E. B.
Fortenberry	McCaul (TX)	Smith (TX)				Cummings	Johnson, Sam
Fossella	McCollum (MN)	Smith (WA)				Davis (AL)	Jones (NC)
Frank (MA)	McCotter	Snyder				Davis (CA)	Jordan
Frelinghuysen	McCrery	Souder				Davis (IL)	Kagen
Gallegly	McDermott	Space				Davis (KY)	Kanjorski
Gerlach	McGovern	Spratt				Davis, David	Kaptur
Giffords	McHenry	Stark				Davis, Lincoln	Keller
Gilchrest	McHugh	Stupak				Davis, Tom	Kennedy
Gillibrand	McIntyre	Sutton				DeFazio	Kildee
Gonzalez	McKeon	Tanner				DeGette	Kilpatrick
Goode	McMorris	Tauscher				Delahunt	Kind
Goodlatte	Rodgers	Taylor				DeLauro	King (IA)

NAYS—49

NOT VOTING—27

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1453

Mr. PENCE and Mr. LAMBORN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. SOLIS. Madam Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 62, on motion to suspend and pass H.R. 1834, authorizing Ocean Exploration Program Act, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea”.

MAKING TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO THE FEDERAL INSECTICIDE, FUNGICIDE, AND RODENTICIDE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2571, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2571. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 400, nays 0, not voting 28, as follows:

Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky

Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry

Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 403, nays 0, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 64]

YEAS—403

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio

DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallely
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam

Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer

Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard

Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner

Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—28

Ackerman
Bishop (UT)
Brown, Corrine
Burgess
Capuano
Conyers
Deal (GA)
Drake
Engel
Eshoo

Feeney
Granger
Hayes
Hinojosa
Honda
Jones (OH)
Klein (FL)
Udall (CO)
Lowey
Miller (NC)
Moore (WI)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1459

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. SOLIS. Madam Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 63, on motion to suspend and pass S. 2571, FIFRA Amendments, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

HONORING AND PRAISING THE NAACP ON ITS 99TH ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 289, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 289.

NOT VOTING—25

Ackerman
Bishop (UT)
Brown, Corrine
Burgess
Carney
Conyers
Crowley
Cuellar
Deal (GA)

Doolittle
Drake
Engel
Hayes
Honda
Jones (OH)
Lowey
Miller (NC)
Neal (MA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in the vote.

□ 1507

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. SOLIS. Madam Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 64, on motion to suspend and pass H. Con. Res. 289, praising the NAACP, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 62, 63, and 64, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1 of rule IX, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has been made aware of a valid basis for the gentleman's point of personal privilege.

The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, it is with great regret, but I must rise today for a question of personal privilege. An article appeared today, Madam Speaker, on the Web site of a publication called *The Politico* reprinting a statement by a spokesperson for the majority leader of this House describing actions of mine as "incomprehensible" and "unjustifiable" and insinuating that I purposely brought disrespect to the House and to the memory of my dear friend and colleague, Congressman Tom Lantos.

It was not my actions which were incomprehensible or unjustifiable, Madam Speaker, but rather the actions of the majority which deprived all Members of this House the opportunity to debate or even consider or vote on the contempt resolutions brought to the floor today by the majority in an absolutely totally unprecedented fashion.

The majority knows that the rule we considered earlier is totally and absolutely unprecedented. Its sole purpose was to prevent us from even debating or voting on these contempt resolutions. And further, the majority denied us the opportunity to take up the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act amendments passed by the Senate, which we feel very strongly are in the supreme national interest of the United States.

The majority knew that the minority was strongly of the belief that the only options available to us were procedural votes. The majority knew that we intended to utilize our procedural options to register our displeasure with this uncalled-for process.

We purposely refrained from all procedural motions during the opening moments of the session today precisely to show respect for our friend and departed colleague.

We were assured by the majority that we would not begin consideration of the rule, in other words, that the House would not reconvene until 11:30 a.m. or the conclusion of Mr. Lantos' memorial service.

Tom Lantos, Madam Speaker, was an extraordinary man, a great man, and he was my friend. It was an honor for me to be present today at his memorial service in Statuary Hall. I was suddenly summoned out of the memorial service for my friend Mr. Lantos to perform my responsibilities as a member of the Rules Committee, to manage the rule for the minority side for the contempt resolutions. The majority had decided to resume the session during the memorial service.

Madam Speaker, I am a member of the minority. Neither I nor my leadership control when the House convenes. What we saw today was an uncalled-for

effort by the majority to force the minority to give up our rights to protest a process we feel is blatantly unfair.

The majority's decision to reconvene the House interrupted the tribute to my good friend Mr. Lantos. It is the majority that decides when to convene the House. It is the majority that chose to convene the House even though many speakers remained to speak in the memorial for Mr. Lantos.

I was told by my good friend Mr. DREIER that he does not recall any memorial being interrupted by a House session, and he has been here more years than I have. I have been here 15, and obviously I don't recall any either.

Madam Speaker, the statement attacking me today by a spokesperson for the majority leader was totally uncalled for and unacceptable.

I yield such time as he may consume to the ranking member of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding. And we have all come to the conclusion that this has been a very sad day in many ways. Of course, the saddest part of it was the loss of our dear friend and colleague, Tom Lantos.

I would simply like to say that Mr. DIAZ-BALART had the responsibility of serving as the floor manager for a rule that was, as he said in his very thoughtful statement, unprecedented. And we had a debate on that rule, and this House chose to do something it had never done before, pass a rule which took two contempt resolutions and adopted them. That was a decision of the House. And I think it was an unfortunate one.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART had a responsibility to stand up for this institution. He and I stood together at that service, heard from colleagues of ours and heard from many other distinguished people who remembered the life of Tom Lantos.

□ 1515

We were stunned when all of a sudden the bells rang and the House was going to reconvene in the middle of this memorial service.

Now, members of the majority staff, Madam Speaker, had been informed, had been informed, of exactly what it was that we in the minority were going to do. If the House reconvened and we proceeded with consideration of this special rule, we had informed the members of the majority staff that we were going to call for a vote.

So Mr. DIAZ-BALART was simply working to, under very, very, very challenging, and, again, from my perspective, unprecedented circumstances, where I had never before seen the House of Representatives convened during a memorial service being held in Statuary Hall, but under those circumstances, Mr. DIAZ-BALART had the responsibility to fulfill his duties, not to the Republican Members, but to do what he believed to be right, and I agree with him, obviously, in uphold-

ing the rights of this institution. So for any Member, any Member or anyone outside to malign Mr. DIAZ-BALART for simply doing his job under very difficult circumstances is not right.

Let me conclude by simply saying that Mr. DIAZ-BALART is one of those Members who we all know is a fighter for freedom and has been throughout his entire life. In many respects, LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART is very similar to Tom Lantos.

Madam Speaker, I will say that it is a tragic irony that as we are remembering the life of Tom Lantos that a Member like LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART would in any way be maligned for his work on behalf of the struggle for freedom and democracy and the liberation of people all over this world.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would say, of course, we come to the floor today with lots of disappointment on what we are failing to do today. We think we should stay until we get other matters done. But on this issue that relates to the activities of the day, first of all, I was at the memorial service, as many of you were. I was privileged to be there. Frankly, there are very few Members of Congress, in the history of the Congress, that could have, on the very short notice that we would have this sad service today, would have the Foreign Minister of Israel, the Secretary of State, the head of the United Nations, the Speaker of the House present. It was an impressive service, and I hate that we are having this debate around any lack of respect for that service.

On the other hand, the only work we had to do today was 1 hour of debate on a rule that would then also replace the debate. One hour of debate. The service was scheduled to last from 10 o'clock until 11:30. It turned out it lasted until 11:50. But it was scheduled to last from 10 o'clock until 11:30.

When at 10:45 the majority decides we are going to start the 1 hour of work we have to do today at 11, the majority should expect the other side to complain. If in fact Mr. DIAZ-BALART had not had his objection, 50 minutes of that 1-hour debate would have gone before I ever walked out of the memorial service. The vote lasted 50 minutes, or thereabouts. Apparently, Members couldn't even get in to vote for 50 minutes, let alone to get in to participate in the debate.

Of course, we should have said, let's not start the debate on the only work we are doing today while we are passing up the work on the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. We are voting to talk about how you can kill rats in the technical correction to the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act. That is the only debate we were going to have during 50 minutes of the

1 hour of the memorial service. And of course LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART or somebody should have stepped up to stop that, and thank goodness he did.

I am really sad that a service we should have all agreed on would be the priority of the morning, we couldn't manage for that to be the priority of the morning. We had to start the 1 hour of work we had to do 50 minutes before that service turned out to end and 30 minutes before it was scheduled to end.

I am regretful that my good friend had to rise to this moment of personal privilege, but I certainly support him in seeking this privilege and hope that the Members of the House will understand what happened here and appreciate the great respect we all have for Tom Lantos.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I rise, as I have a couple of times in the past, to simply say that I think on our side, obviously, we believed that we needed to move forward on the work. All of us, however, share what has been said about Tom Lantos, for whom we had the greatest respect, and we all share a sadness at his loss.

I regret that the actions that precipitated this hour that you are taking have occurred. They have occurred. We can't change them. Having said that, I want to say that I understand the point the gentleman is making, and I understand the point my friend Mr. BLUNT has made. I think it will suffice to say that. But I can appreciate the position the gentleman found himself in and that Mr. BLUNT and his leadership found themselves in.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Thank you.

Madam Speaker, I utilized the opportunity of the rules to rise to a question of personal privilege due to the statements attributed in the press that I mentioned before to a spokesperson, which I stated and restated I believe were totally uncalled for and unacceptable.

I thank all of you for having listened to me with such courtesy. It is for someone who arrived as a 4-year-old refugee with his family fleeing oppression, an extraordinary moment in the midst of the sadness of the day, and the offense that I felt, it is an extraordinary moment to be able to rise and invoke the rules of the House to seek the attention of the representatives of this extraordinary Nation. So I thank each and every one of you for your patience and your courtesy.

At this point, after thanking Mr. DREIER, thanking Mr. BLUNT, and thanking the majority leader for their kind words, I simply end remembering a friend who everyone in this room can agree enriched our lives. My son mentioned the other day this week when we were talking about the sad news, he said, Dad, do you remember when I was

a little kid and you wanted me to get my posture up, what you would tell me? I will never forget, he told me. Lantos. Your posture. That is one of the first things that impressed me about Tom Lantos, even before I learned about his zealous extraordinary commitment to the oppressed everywhere where people are still longing to be free.

So let us all then end this recollection of what I believe was a very unfortunate moment remembering someone who we can all agree was extraordinary, enriched our lives, and was a great Member of Congress and a great American. Thank you all very much.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 4169, by the yeas and nays;
H. Res. 790, by the yeas and nays;
H. Res. 963, by the yeas and nays;
H. Res. 972, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

AMERICAN BRAILLE FLAG MEMORIAL ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4169, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4169.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 396, nays 0, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 65]

YEAS—396

Abercrombie	Blackburn	Cannon	Johnson (GA)	Paul
Aderholt	Blumenauer	Cantor	Johnson (IL)	Payne
Akin	Blunt	Capito	Johnson, E. B.	Pearce
Alexander	Boehner	Capps	Johnson, Sam	Pence
Allen	Bonner	Capuano	Jones (NC)	Perlmutter
Altmire	Bono Mack	Cardoza	Jordan	Peterson (MN)
Andrews	Boozman	Carnahan	Kagen	Petri
Arcuri	Boren	Carney	Kanjorski	Pickering
Baca	Boswell	Carter	Kaptur	Pitts
Bachmann	Boucher	Castle	Keller	Platts
Bachus	Boustany	Castor	Kennedy	Poe
Baird	Boyd (FL)	Chabot	Kildee	Pomeroy
Baldwin	Boyd (KS)	Chandler	Kilpatrick	Porter
Barrett (SC)	Brady (PA)	Clarke	Kind	Price (GA)
Barrow	Brady (TX)	Clay	King (IA)	Price (NC)
Bartlett (MD)	Braley (IA)	Cleaver	King (NY)	Pryce (OH)
Bean	Brown (GA)	Clyburn	Kingston	Putnam
Becerra	Brown (SC)	Coble	Kirk	Radanovich
Berkley	Brown-Waite,	Cohen	Klein (FL)	Rahall
Berman	Ginny	Cole (OK)	Kline (MN)	Ramstad
Berry	Buchanan	Conaway	Knollenberg	Rangel
Biggert	Burton (IN)	Conyers	Kucinich	Regula
Bilbray	Butterfield	Cooper	Kuhl (NY)	Rehberg
Bilirakis	Buyer	Costa	LaHood	Reichert
Bishop (GA)	Calvert	Costello	Lamborn	Renzi
Bishop (NY)	Camp (MI)	Courtney	Lampson	Reyes
Bishop (UT)	Campbell (CA)	Cramer	Langevin	Reynolds
			Larsen (WA)	Richardson
			Larson (CT)	Rodriguez
			Latham	Rogers (AL)
			LaTourette	Rogers (KY)
			Latta	Rogers (MI)
			Lee	Rohrabacher
			Levin	Ros-Lehtinen
			Lewis (CA)	Roskam
			Lewis (GA)	Ross
			Lewis (KY)	Rothman
			Linder	Roybal-Allard
			Lipinski	Royce
			LoBiondo	Rush
			Loebach	Ryan (OH)
			Lucas	Ryan (WI)
			Lungren, Daniel	Salazar
			E.	Sali
			Lynch	Sánchez, Linda
			Mack	T.
			Mahoney (FL)	Sarbanes
			Maloney (NY)	Saxton
			Manzullo	Schakowsky
			Marchant	Schiff
			Markey	Schmidt
			Marshall	Schwartz
			Matheson	Scott (GA)
			Matsui	Scott (VA)
			McCarthy (CA)	Sensenbrenner
			McCarthy (NY)	Serrano
			McCaul (TX)	Sessions
			McCollum (MN)	Shadegg
			McCotter	Shays
			McCrery	Shea-Porter
			McDermott	Sherman
			McGovern	Shimkus
			McHenry	Shuler
			McHugh	Shuster
			McIntyre	Simpson
			McKeon	Sires
			McMorris	Skelton
			Rodgers	Slaughter
			McNulty	Smith (NE)
			Meek (FL)	Smith (NJ)
			Meeks (NY)	Smith (TX)
			Melancon	Smith (WA)
			Mica	Snyder
			Michaud	Souder
			Miller (FL)	Space
			Miller (MI)	Spratt
			Miller (NC)	Stark
			Miller, Gary	Stearns
			Mitchell	Stupak
			Mollohan	Sullivan
			Moore (KS)	Sutton
			Moore (WI)	Tancred
			Moran (KS)	Tanner
			Moran (VA)	Tauscher
			Murphy (CT)	Taylor
			Murphy, Patrick	Terry
			Murtha	Thompson (MS)
			Musgrave	Thornberry
			Myrick	Tiahrt
			Nadler	Tiberi
			Napolitano	Tierney
			Neugebauer	Turner
			Nunes	Udall (NM)
			Oberstar	Upton
			Obey	Van Hollen
			Olver	Velázquez
			Ortiz	Visclosky
			Pallone	Walberg
			Pastor	Walden (OR)

Walsh (NY) Waxman Wilson (SC)
Walz (MN) Weiner Wolfman (VA)
Wamp Weldon (FL) Wolf
Wasserman Westmoreland Woolsey
Schultz Wexler Wu
Waters Whitfield (KY) Yarmuth
Watson Wilson (NM) Young (AK)
Watt Wilson (OH) Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—32

Ackerman Honda Sanchez, Loretta
Barton (TX) Jones (OH) Sestak
Brown, Corrine Lofgren, Zoe Solis
Burgess Lowey Thompson (CA)
Deal (GA) McNerney Towns
Doyle Miller, George Tsongas
Drake Murphy, Tim Udall (CO)
Engel Neal (MA) Welch (VT)
Eshoo Pascarell Weller
Hall (NY) Peterson (PA) Wynn
Hayes Ruppersberger

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 5 minutes remaining on this vote.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain on this vote.

□ 1543

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HALL of New York. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 65, I was chairing the VA Disabilities Subcommittee hearing. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Ms. SOLIS. Madam Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 65, on motion to suspend and pass H.R. 4169, Placement of American Braille Tactile Flag, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. SESTAK. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 65, H.R. 4169, I was at a special access briefing with U.S. Air Force and immediately attempted to return but votes closed just as I arrived. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 65, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 65, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

COMMENDING THE PEOPLE OF WASHINGTON FOR SHOWING THEIR SUPPORT FOR VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 790, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 790.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 383, nays 0, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 66]

YEAS—383

Abercrombie Dreier LaHood
Aderholt Duncan Lamborn
Akin Edwards Lampson
Alexander Ehlers Langevin
Allen Ellison Larsen (WA)
Altmire Ellsworth Larson (CT)
Arcuri Emanuel Latham
Bachmann Emerson LaTourette
Bachus English (PA) Latta
Baird Etheridge Lee
Baldwin Everett Levin
Barrett (SC) Fallon Lewis (CA)
Barrow Farr Lewis (GA)
Bartlett (MD) Fattah Lewis (KY)
Bean Feeney Linder
Becerra Ferguson Lipinski
Berkley Filner LoBiondo
Berman Flake Loeb sack
Berry Forbes Lucas
Biggart Portenberry Lungren, Daniel
Bilbray Fossella E.
Bilirakis Foxx Lynch
Bishop (GA) Frank (MA) Mack
Bishop (NY) Franks (AZ) Mahoney (FL)
Bishop (UT) Frelinghuysen Maloney (NY)
Blackburn Gallegly Manzullo
Blumenauer Garrett (NJ) Marchant
Bonner Gerlach Markey
Bono Mack Giffords Marshall
Boozman Gilchrest Matheson
Boren Gillibrand Matsui
Boucher Gingrey McCarthy (CA)
Boustany Gonzalez McCarthy (NY)
Boyd (FL) Goode McCaul (TX)
Boyd (KS) Goodlatte McCollum (MN)
Brady (PA) Gordon McCotter
Brady (TX) Granger McCreery
Braley (IA) Graves McDermott
Broun (GA) Green, Al McGovern
Brown (SC) Green, Gene McHenry
Brown-Waite, Grijalva McHugh
Ginny Gutierrez McIntyre
Buchanan Hall (NY) McKeon
Burton (IN) Hall (TX) McMorris
Butterfield Hare Rodgers
Buyer Harman McNerney
Calvert Hastings (FL) McNulty
Camp (MI) Hastings (WA) Meek (FL)
Campbell (CA) Heller Meeks (NY)
Cannon Hensarling Melancon
Capito Herger Mica
Capps Herseth Sandlin Michaud
Capuano Higgins Miller (FL)
Cardoza Hill Miller (MI)
Carnahan Hinchey Miller (NC)
Carney Hinojosa Miller, Gary
Carter Hirono Mitchell
Castle Hobson Mollohan
Castor Hodes Moore (KS)
Chabot Hoekstra Moore (WI)
Chandler Holden Moran (KS)
Clarke Holt Moran (VA)
Clay Hooley Murphy (CT)
Cleaver Hoyer Murphy, Patrick
Clyburn Hulshof Murphy, Tim
Coble Hunter Murtha
Cohen Inglis (SC) Musgrave
Cole (OK) Inslee Myrick
Conaway Israel Nadler
Conyers Jackson (IL) Napolitano
Cooper Jackson-Lee Neugebauer
Costa (TX) Nunes
Costello Jefferson Oberstar
Courtney Johnson (GA) Obey
Cramer Johnson (IL) Ortiz
Crenshaw Johnson, E. B. Pallone
Crowley Johnson, Sam Pastor
Cubin Jones (NC) Paul
Culberson Jordan Payne
Cummings Kagen Pearce
Davis (AL) Kanjorski Pence
Davis (CA) Kaptur Perlmutter
Davis (IL) Keller Peterson (MN)
Davis (KY) Kennedy Petri
Davis, Lincoln Kildee Pickering
Davis, Tom Kilpatrick Pitts
DeFazio Kind Poe
DeGette King (IA) Pomeroy
DeLauro King (NY) Porter
Dent Kingston Price (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L. Kirk Price (NC)
Diaz-Balart, M. Klein (FL) Rahall
Dicks Kline (MN) Ramstad
Dingell Knollenberg Rangel
Doggett Kucinich Regula
Donnelly Kuhl (NY) Rehberg

Reichert Shadegg Tsongas
Renzi Sha's Udall (NM)
Reyes Shea-Porter Upton
Reynolds Sherman Van Hollen
Richardson Shimkus Velázquez
Rodriguez Shuler Visclosky
Rogers (AL) Shuster Walden (OR)
Rogers (KY) Simpson Walsh (NY)
Rogers (MI) Sires Walsh (MN)
Rohrabacher Skelton Wamp
Roskam Slaughter Wasserman
Ross Smith (NE) Schultz
Rothman Smith (NJ) Waters
Roybal-Allard Smith (TX) Watson
Royce Smith (WA) Watt
Ryan (OH) Snyder Weiner
Ryan (WI) Souder Welch (VT)
Salazar Space Weldon (FL)
Sánchez, Linda Spratt Weller
T. Stark
Sanchez, Loretta Stupak Stearns
Sarbanes Sullivan
Saxton Sullivan
Schakowsky Tancredo
Schiff Tanner
Schmidt Tauscher
Schwartz Taylor
Scott (GA) Terry
Scott (VA) Thompson (MS)
Sensenbrenner Thornberry
Serrano Tiahrt
Sessions Tiberi
Sestak Tierney

NOT VOTING—45

Ackerman Doyle Peterson (PA)
Andrews Drake Platts
Baca Engel Pryce (OH)
Barton (TX) Eshoo Putnam
Blunt Gohmert Radanovich
Boehner Hayes Ros-Lehtinen
Boswell Honda Ruppersberger
Brown, Corrine Issa Rush
Burgess Jones (OH) Solis
Cantor Lofgren, Zoe Thompson (CA)
Cuellar Lowey Towns
Davis, David Miller, George Turner
Deal (GA) Neal (MA) Udall (CO)
Delahunt Oliver Walberg
Doolittle Pascarell Wynn

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain on this vote.

□ 1550

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. SOLIS. Madam Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 66, on motion to suspend the rules and pass H. Res. 790, Commending State of Washington for Showing Their Support for Veterans, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL SALUTE TO HOSPITALIZED VETERANS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 963, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 963.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 384, nays 0, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 67]

YEAS—384

Aderholt	Diaz-Balart, L.	Kilpatrick
Akin	Diaz-Balart, M.	Kind
Alexander	Dicks	King (IA)
Allen	Dingell	King (NY)
Altmire	Doggett	Kingston
Arcuri	Donnelly	Kirk
Baca	Doolittle	Klein (FL)
Bachmann	Dreier	Kline (MN)
Bachus	Duncan	Knollenberg
Baird	Edwards	Kucinich
Baldwin	Ehlers	Kuhl (NY)
Barrow	Ellison	LaHood
Bartlett (MD)	Ellsworth	Lamborn
Bean	Emanuel	Lampson
Becerra	Emerson	Langevin
Berkley	English (PA)	Larsen (WA)
Berman	Etheridge	Larson (CT)
Berry	Everett	Latham
Biggert	Fallin	LaTourette
Billbray	Farr	Latta
Bilirakis	Fattah	Lee
Bishop (GA)	Ferguson	Levin
Bishop (NY)	Filner	Lewis (CA)
Bishop (UT)	Flake	Lewis (GA)
Blackburn	Forbes	Lewis (KY)
Blumenauer	Fortenberry	Linder
Blunt	Fossella	Lipinski
Boehner	Fox	LoBiondo
Bono Mack	Frank (MA)	Loeb
Boozman	Franks (AZ)	Lucas
Boren	Frelinghuysen	Lungren, Daniel E.
Boswell	Gallely	Lynch
Boucher	Garrett (NJ)	Mack
Boustany	Gerlach	Mahoney (FL)
Boyd (FL)	Giffords	Maloney (NY)
Boyd (KS)	Gilchrest	Manzullo
Brady (PA)	Gillibrand	Marchant
Brady (TX)	Gingrey	Mark
Braley (IA)	Gonzalez	Marshall
Brown (SC)	Goode	Matheson
Brown-Waite, Ginny	Goodlatte	Matsui
Buchanan	Gordon	McCarthy (CA)
Burton (IN)	Granger	McCarthy (NY)
Butterfield	Graves	McCaul (TX)
Buyer	Green, Al	McCollum (MN)
Calvert	Green, Gene	McCotter
Camp (MI)	Grijalva	McCrery
Campbell (CA)	Gutierrez	McDermott
Cannon	Hall (NY)	McGovern
Cantor	Hall (TX)	McHenry
Capito	Hare	McHugh
Capps	Harman	McIntyre
Capuano	Hastings (FL)	McKeon
Cardoza	Hastings (WA)	McMorris
Carnahan	Heller	Rodgers
Carney	Hensarling	McNulty
Carter	Herger	Meek (FL)
Castle	Herseth Sandlin	Meeks (NY)
Castor	Higgins	Melancon
Chabot	Hill	Mica
Chandler	Hinche	Michaud
Clarke	Hinojosa	Miller (FL)
Clay	Hirono	Miller (MI)
Clyburn	Hobson	Miller (NC)
Coble	Hoekstra	Miller, Gary
Cohen	Holden	Mitchell
Cole (OK)	Holt	Mollohan
Conaway	Hoolley	Moore (KS)
Cooper	Hoyer	Moore (WI)
Costa	Hulshof	Moran (KS)
Costello	Hunter	Moran (VA)
Courtney	Inglis (SC)	Murphy (CT)
Cramer	Inslee	Murphy, Patrick
Crenshaw	Israel	Murphy, Tim
Crowley	Issa	Murtha
Cubin	Jackson (IL)	Musgrave
Cuellar	Jackson-Lee	Myrick
Culberson	(TX)	Nadler
Cummings	Jefferson	Napolitano
Davis (AL)	Johnson (GA)	Neugebauer
Davis (CA)	Johnson (IL)	Nunes
Davis (IL)	Johnson, E. B.	Oberstar
Davis (KY)	Johnson, Sam	Obey
Davis, David	Jones (NC)	Oliver
Davis, Lincoln	Jordan	Ortiz
Davis, Tom	Kagen	Pallone
DeFazio	Kanjorski	Pastor
DeGette	Kaptur	Paul
DeLauro	Keller	Payne
Dent	Kennedy	
	Kildee	

Pearce	Sanchez, Loretta	Taylor
Perlmutter	Sarbanes	Terry
Peterson (MN)	Saxton	Thompson (MS)
Petri	Schakowsky	Thornberry
Pitts	Schiff	Tiahrt
Poe	Schmidt	Tiberi
Pomeroy	Schwartz	Tierney
Porter	Scott (GA)	Tsongas
Price (GA)	Scott (VA)	Turner
Price (NC)	Sensenbrenner	Udall (NM)
Putnam	Serrano	Upton
Radanovich	Sessions	Van Hollen
Rahall	Sestak	Velázquez
Ramstad	Shadegg	Visclosky
Rangel	Shays	Walberg
Regula	Shea-Porter	Walden (OR)
Rehberg	Sherman	Walz (MN)
Reichert	Shimkus	Wamp
Renzi	Shuler	Wasserman
Reyes	Shuster	Schultz
Reynolds	Simpson	Waters
Richardson	Sires	Watson
Rodriguez	Skelton	Watt
Rogers (AL)	Slaughter	Waxman
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NE)	Weiner
Rogers (MI)	Smith (NJ)	Welch (VT)
Rohrabacher	Smith (TX)	Weller
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (WA)	Wexler
Roskam	Snyder	Whitfield (KY)
Ross	Souder	Wilson (NM)
Rothman	Space	Wilson (OH)
Roybal-Allard	Spratt	Wilson (SC)
Royce	Stark	Wittman (VA)
Ryan (OH)	Stearns	Wolf
Ryan (WI)	Stupak	Woolsey
Salazar	Sutton	Wu
Sali	Tancredo	Yarmuth
Sanchez, Linda T.	Tanner	Young (AK)
	Tauscher	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—44

Abercrombie	Engel	Pickering
Ackerman	Eshoo	Platts
Andrews	Feeney	Pryce (OH)
Barrett (SC)	Gohmert	Ruppersberger
Barton (TX)	Hayes	Rush
Bonner	Hodes	Solis
Brown (GA)	Honda	Sullivan
Brown, Corrine	Jones (OH)	Thompson (CA)
Burgess	Lofgren, Zoe	Towns
Cleaver	Lowe	Udall (CO)
Conyers	Miller, George	Walsh (NY)
Deal (GA)	Neal (MA)	Weldon (FL)
Delahunt	Pascrell	Westmoreland
Doyle	Pence	Wynn
Drake	Peterson (PA)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain on this vote.

□ 1556

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. SOLIS. Madam Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 67 on motion to suspend and pass H. Res. 963, National Salute to Hospitalized Veterans Week, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF AMERICAN HEART MONTH AND NATIONAL WEAR RED DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 972, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 972.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 389, nays 0, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 68]

YEAS—389

Aderholt	Davis (IL)	Jefferson
Akin	Davis (KY)	Johnson (GA)
Alexander	Davis, David	Johnson (IL)
Allen	Davis, Lincoln	Johnson, E. B.
Altmire	DeFazio	Johnson, Sam
Arcuri	DeGette	Jordan
Baca	DeLauro	Kagen
Bachmann	Dent	Kanjorski
Bachus	Diaz-Balart, L.	Kaptur
Baird	Diaz-Balart, M.	Keller
Baldwin	Dicks	Kennedy
Barrett (SC)	Dingell	Kildee
Barrow	Doggett	Kilpatrick
Bartlett (MD)	Donnelly	Kind
Bean	Doolittle	King (IA)
Becerra	Dreier	King (NY)
Berkley	Duncan	Kingston
Berman	Edwards	Kirk
Berry	Ehlers	Klein (FL)
Biggert	Ellsworth	Kline (MN)
Billbray	Emanuel	Knollenberg
Bilirakis	Emerson	Kucinich
Bishop (GA)	English (PA)	Kuhl (NY)
Bishop (NY)	Etheridge	LaHood
Bishop (UT)	Everett	Lamborn
Blackburn	Fallin	Lampson
Blumenauer	Farr	Langevin
Blunt	Fattah	Larsen (WA)
Boehner	Feeney	Larson (CT)
Bonner	Ferguson	Latham
Bono Mack	Filner	LaTourette
Boozman	Flake	Latta
Boswell	Forbes	Lee
Boucher	Fortenberry	Levin
Boustany	Fossella	Lewis (CA)
Boyd (FL)	Fox	Lewis (GA)
Boyd (KS)	Frank (MA)	Lewis (KY)
Brady (PA)	Franks (AZ)	Linder
Brady (TX)	Frelinghuysen	Lipinski
Braley (IA)	Gallely	LoBiondo
Broun (GA)	Garrett (NJ)	Loeb
Brown (SC)	Gerlach	Lucas
Brown-Waite, Ginny	Giffords	Lungren, Daniel E.
Buchanan	Gilchrest	Lynch
Burton (IN)	Gillibrand	Mack
Butterfield	Gingrey	Mahoney (FL)
Buyer	Gonzalez	Maloney (NY)
Calvert	Goode	Manzullo
Camp (MI)	Goodlatte	Marchant
Campbell (CA)	Gordon	Mark
Cannon	Granger	Markey
Cantor	Graves	Marshall
Capito	Green, Al	Matheson
Capps	Grijalva	Matsui
Capuano	Gutierrez	McCarthy (CA)
Cardoza	Hall (NY)	McCarthy (NY)
Carnahan	Hall (TX)	McCaul (TX)
Carney	Hare	McCollum (MN)
Carter	Harman	McCotter
Castle	Hastings (FL)	McCrery
Castor	Hastings (WA)	McDermott
Chabot	Heller	McGovern
Chandler	Hensarling	McHenry
Clarke	Herger	McHugh
Clay	Herseth Sandlin	McIntyre
Cleaver	Higgins	McKeon
Clyburn	Hill	McMorris
Coble	Hinche	Rodgers
Cohen	Hinojosa	McNulty
Cole (OK)	Hirono	Meek (FL)
Conaway	Hobson	Meeks (NY)
Conyers	Hodes	Melancon
Cooper	Hoekstra	Mica
Costa	Holden	Michaud
Costello	Holt	Miller (FL)
Courtney	Hoolley	Miller (MI)
Cramer	Hoyer	Miller (NC)
Crenshaw	Hulshof	Miller, Gary
Crowley	Hunter	Mitchell
Cubin	Inglis (SC)	Mollohan
Cuellar	Inslee	Moore (KS)
Culberson	Israel	Moore (WI)
Cummings	Issa	Moran (KS)
Davis (AL)	Jackson (IL)	Moran (VA)
Davis (CA)	Jackson-Lee	Murphy (CT)
Davis (IL)	(TX)	

Murphy, Patrick	Ross	Sutton
Murphy, Tim	Rothman	Tancred
Murtha	Roybal-Allard	Tanner
Musgrave	Royce	Tauscher
Myrick	Rush	Taylor
Nadler	Ryan (OH)	Terry
Napolitano	Ryan (WI)	Thompson (MS)
Neugebauer	Salazar	Thornberry
Nunes	Sali	Tiahrt
Oberstar	Sánchez, Linda	Tiberi
Obey	T.	Tierney
Olver	Sanchez, Loretta	Tsongas
Ortiz	Sarbanes	Turner
Pallone	Saxton	Udall (NM)
Pastor	Schakowsky	Upton
Paul	Schiff	Van Hollen
Payne	Schmidt	Velázquez
Pence	Schwartz	Visclosky
Perlmutter	Scott (GA)	Walberg
Peterson (MN)	Scott (VA)	Walden (OR)
Petri	Sensenbrenner	Walsh (NY)
Pitts	Serrano	Walz (MN)
Poe	Sessions	Wamp
Pomeroy	Sestak	Wasserman
Porter	Shadegg	Schultz
Price (GA)	Shays	Waters
Price (NC)	Shea-Porter	Watson
Putnam	Sherman	Watt
Radanovich	Shimkus	Waxman
Rahall	Shuler	Weiner
Ramstad	Shuster	Welch (VT)
Rangel	Simpson	Weldon (FL)
Regula	Sires	Weller
Rehberg	Skelton	Westmoreland
Reichert	Slaughter	Wexler
Renzi	Smith (NE)	Whitfield (KY)
Reyes	Smith (NJ)	Wilson (NM)
Reynolds	Smith (WA)	Wilson (OH)
Richardson	Snyder	Wilson (SC)
Rodriguez	Souder	Wittman (VA)
Rogers (AL)	Space	Wolf
Rogers (KY)	Spratt	Wu
Rogers (MI)	Stark	Yarmuth
Rohrabacher	Stearns	Young (AK)
Ros-Lehtinen	Stupak	Young (FL)
Roskam	Sullivan	

NOT VOTING—39

Abercrombie	Engel	Pearce
Ackerman	Eshoo	Peterson (PA)
Andrews	Gohmert	Pickering
Barton (TX)	Green, Gene	Platts
Boren	Hayes	Pryce (OH)
Brown, Corrine	Honda	Ruppersberger
Burgess	Jones (NC)	Smith (TX)
Davis, Tom	Jones (OH)	Solis
Deal (GA)	Lofgren, Zoe	Thompson (CA)
Delahunt	Lowe	Towns
Doyle	Miller, George	Udall (CO)
Drake	Neal (MA)	Woolsey
Ellison	Pascarell	Wynn

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1603

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 68, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Ms. SOLIS. Madam Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 68, on motion to suspend and pass H. Res. 972, American Heart Month and National Wear Red Day, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. DRAKE. Madam Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 61–68, I was attending a funeral for a Navy Seal. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on each rollcall.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Madam Speaker, due to events in my district I will miss votes on February 14, 2008. Had I been present, the RECORD would reflect the following votes:

H. Res. 982, providing for the adoption of H. Res. 979 and H. Res. 980, contempt of Congress resolutions, "yea."

H. Res. 966, honoring African-American inventors, past and present, for their leadership, courage, and significant contributions to our national competitiveness, "yea."

H.R. 1834, National Ocean Exploration Program Act, "yea."

S. 2571, to make technical corrections to the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, "yea."

H. Con. Res. 289, honoring and praising the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the occasion of its 99th anniversary, "yea."

H.R. 4169, American Braille Flag Memorial Act, "yea."

H. Res. 790, commending the people of the State of Washington for showing their support for the needs of the State of Washington's veterans and encouraging residents of the other States to pursue creative ways to show their own support for veterans, "yea."

H. Res. 963, supporting the goals and ideals of National Salute to Hospitalized Veterans Week, "yea."

H. Res. 972, supporting the goals and ideals of American Heart Month and National Wear Red Day, "yea."

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COURTNEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CUMMINGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SALI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SALI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

UNILATERAL DISARMAMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, we leave today for the President's Day Recess. We leave at a time where we have our troops committed in Iraq, we have our troops committed in Afghanistan, where, in the last 48 hours there have been reports that radical Islamists have perhaps been plotting an attack to assassinate the President of the Philippines, where al Qaeda in Iraq has said that they are going to launch new attacks or additional attacks against Israel, against Jerusalem, where there have been arrests in Denmark of individuals perhaps planning to assassinate, murder the cartoonists, their declaration of war by Hezbollah.

And we're going back home without extending the Protect America Act. It's unilateral disarmament. The head of our intelligence community has said that the Protect America Act, that the authorities provided under FISA have been the tip of the spear in keeping America safe.

But it is not only about keeping America safe, because the information, the intelligence that we have gathered under the Protect America Act, under FISA, over the last 6 years have kept America safe, but has also enabled us to identify threats and potential attacks against our allies.

And what this now does, this unilateral disarmament, means that an important tool in keeping America safe and our allies safe expires on Saturday night.

If you take a look at what's happened here, it's the day after September 11. The President, meeting with his national security team, they're looking for ways to identify exactly what the other threats are against the United States, what the capabilities of al Qaeda are. They come back with some

suggestions and ideas, one of which is to use our telecommunications folks, perhaps, and others, to get information and insights into al Qaeda and to radical jihadists.

Members of Congress are brought in. The current Speaker of the House was briefed four times, I believe, within the first 8 months in terms of what we were going to do, what we expected to collect and how that would keep us safe. And today, these folks are thrown under the bus.

This unilateral disarmament makes America less safe. The President has said, I'm willing to stay until Congress completes its work. I'm willing to postpone or delay a trip to Africa that's been in the planning stages for a long time so that Congress can complete its work. I'm willing to work with Congress to make that happen.

The Senate did their job. Senator ROCKEFELLER was being briefed at the same time, 6 years ago, that the current Speaker of the House was briefed. He recognizes the responsibility that they have and that the Senate has to making sure that America keeps these tools in the hands of our intelligence community. They did the right thing. Overwhelmingly, the other body passed a bill that keeps America safe, bipartisan, protecting those who helped our government to stay, to put in place the mechanisms to keep us safe over the last 6 years.

And now, the House walks away from this for the next 12 days. And each day that we are gone, our ability to monitor radical jihadists and the threats to the United States begins to erode just a little bit each and every day. But every time we identify potentially a new threat to the United States, we need to go back through a cumbersome process, one that ties the hands of our intelligence community. As al Qaeda and radical jihadists have evolved, and they're becoming more coordinated and more effective in planning attacks against the United States, we're moving back and we're degrading and we are unilaterally disarming.

It is a disappointment and a disgrace that this House is leaving today without finishing this business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 1615

WE ARE STANDING AT A CRITICAL CROSSROAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TIM MURPHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we are facing massive problems with regard to the price of energy. Energy costs money, and expensive energy costs jobs, and we are

seeing that now happen in our economy.

We are standing at a critical crossroad, and if we fail to deal with our energy needs in a responsible way, we will face not only the concerns about the environment, but we will face and we are facing economic recession threats and major job losses.

Earlier today, the Department of Commerce released December's trade deficit numbers, which, once again, strongly underscored the need for American energy independence. The good news is that the trade deficit shrank by 6.9 percent to \$58.76 billion. But the bad news is that energy imports continue to make up over half of our trade deficit, over half, 55 percent. In November, it was the reason why we had major increases.

We continue to see risk that oil was sold for only \$50 a barrel a year ago and gas into \$2.50, and is going to continue to climb.

As long as we continue down this road of importing foreign oil to the United States, we will be allowing OPEC nations to call the shots for our economy and becoming more dependent upon hostile countries for oil. When OPEC manipulates production, rural oil prices soar. And our President is left to go and ask Saudi leaders to produce more oil, more Saudi oil, not more American oil.

We have Venezuelan leader, President Hugo Chavez, threatening to cut off oil to the United States and Exxon. If they were to do that, the price of oil would increase throughout the world. Chavez himself predicted the cost per barrel would double to \$200 and increase our prices. Such a move would show all of these oil-producing countries that they can control our actions by shutting down our access to oil. We've already seen natural gas prices manipulated by Russia. We've seen these energy prices increase. But when we buy oil from countries with a history of supporting terrorism, the worst part about this is we are funding both sides of the war on terror.

Meanwhile, what has Congress done in the last year or two? Well, it's put on an embargo on our own oil. It's blocked exploration for American oil. Congress has voted to prevent oil production, oil drilling in the Atlantic coast, the gulf coast, the Pacific coast, Colorado and Alaska. These bans on drilling for our own oil are particularly preposterous in light of the fact that China and Cuba are drilling within 60 miles of our Florida coast while we are not allowed to drill off our coast.

The U.S. contains 70 percent of the world's shale oil reserves, enough to supply our country with energy for hundreds of years if we are allowed to use it. But rather than turning to this resource that can lead us to energy independence and energy security, we once again turn our backs to it. Last year, we cut off access to 2 trillion barrels of shale oil in the western States in the omnibus spending bill. Such policies have forced us to continue this increase of importing oil.

What happens is the impact upon the American family in terms of costs. We see increased costs for food as we also try using corn for ethanol. But when 20 percent of corn is being used for ethanol, we see the cost of food go up. We see the costs of transporting food go up. We see the cost of wheat climbing because not only is it a concern with regard to shortages of wheat coming from other nations, but it's also a huge concern on the cost of transporting that wheat. So what was \$16 per hundred weight last year for wheat for our bakers to use their flour, now it's \$40, with anticipation to climb much more.

How will Americans react when they know that while Congress continues to embargo the American oil resources, a loaf of bread is going to climb from \$1.50 to \$3 a loaf. Americans don't understand why we cannot drill for our own oil.

Yes, we need to do so many things to clean up the air. Yes, we need to make sure we are investing in clean coal technology so that the 300 years' worth of coal we have in this Nation can be used to cleanly produce electricity. We have to make sure we are using clean nuclear energy. We have to make sure that natural gas is used for what it's supposed to be as a chemical product to make fertilizer rather than producing energy at a very high cost and thereby allow us to use it for making fertilizer and other products that can help also reduce the cost of our food products.

But instead, we continue to say no to American oil, and it just doesn't make sense. Here is what America's going to face by 2050: our energy demands are going to double. That means we have 400 coal-fired power plants that need to be rebuilt and an additional 400 built. We have 100 nuclear power plants that need to be rebuilt because they are old, and we need to build an additional 100.

That means starting in the year 2010, we have to open up a new clean coal power plant every 2½ weeks and a nuclear plant every 2½ months, and we haven't even started building them yet. It cannot be done. Instead, what we are probably going to face is rolling brownouts because the efforts we are doing are not going to suffice.

I hope this House will move forward, take the embargoes off coal, and begin to really move towards clean coal technology and stop the embargo on oil.

THE WHITE FLAG OF SURRENDER?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, it's 4:14 p.m. on the 14th day of the second month of this year. This House is basically empty except for a few of us. Everyone has gone home.

We found time today to do important business for the people of the country.

I have some of the bills that we passed today. One of those was that we had the time to vote after debate on regulating insects, roaches, fungus, and rats in the United States. Oh, such an important piece of legislation that the House of Representatives debated and voted on.

But while we had the time to vote on these important issues of regulating the rats and roaches and fungi in the United States, we didn't take the time to protect the American people from those people throughout the world who want to kill us, who want to do harm to us and our families. And not to America only, but to all freedom countries throughout the world.

Because we didn't have time to work on the Protect America Act, a bill that does exactly what it says, Mr. Speaker, it protects America. It protects America from terrorists. And one of those ways is being able to eavesdrop into conversations when one terrorist overseas talks to another terrorist overseas, amending the FISA, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance, Act. But, oh, we didn't have time to do that.

Mr. Speaker, it troubles me because has the House of Representatives, without firing a shot, raised the "white flag of surrender" to those people who wish to do us harm? The head of the National Intelligence Service has told us that 50 percent of the intelligence that they attained is through FISA. And yet we have cut off that resource by failing to vote on that, failing debate on that. But yet we had time to talk about roaches, rats, and fungi.

Mr. Speaker, this ought not to be. Under FISA, we have been able to prevent crimes from being occurred against the United States. One of those was the bombing of the Brooklyn Bridge, another was the bombing of Fort Dix in New Jersey. Those were prevented because of FISA, because we had the intelligence, because we had the eavesdropping, the legal eavesdropping capability.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has not done a service to the people of the United States by failing to debate this issue and at least have an argument, a lively debate, and then vote on it to protect the United States. The people of the United States deserve better from us. Our job is to protect America through legislation. And, Mr. Speaker, I think we have not done that today because we are off doing other things.

So I hope that I am proven wrong by history that this did not hurt the United States down the road for failing to act on this important legislation. And it's important that the House come back as soon as possible and deal with the issue of protecting America first and making sure that we know what they're saying throughout the world when they want to do us harm, because the people we fight, the war we fight against are people who will do anything to get their way and their radical beliefs including killing chil-

dren and women and the innocents and car bombs and anyone else that gets in their way.

And there is probably joy throughout the terrorist cells in the world that the United States Congress did not do its duty today.

And, Mr. Speaker, that's just the way it is.

THE MILITARY FREEDOM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to follow my friend, a former judge also, from Texas, Mr. POE; and he nailed it on the head. And I tell you, following up on that is another travesty going on this week, and that's why I just filed a bill in the last 15 minutes called the Military Freedom Act.

We are endowed by our creator with liberty. But like any inheritance, we only get to keep it if we are willing to fight for it. That is precisely why so many of our uniformed military members have laid down their lives. And the plain fact is that there is no more important purpose for the Federal Government than to provide for the common defense.

In order to do that, there's got to be a military. But we have all of the rights of freedom of speech. Even those rights have limits, such as when you can't yell "fire" in a crowded theater. There is, however, no right to trespass, there is no right to obstruct lawful ingress and egress into a military recruiter's office. The City of Berkeley, California, chose not to protect the Marines' lawful right to ingress and egress. They instead chose to aid and abet lawbreakers by encouraging them and passing an ordinance to make it easier to violate the Marines' rights.

The restricting of funding that is proposed and put forward in the bill I have just filed has been done previously in matters such as the speed limits of States or to encourage States to limit drinking and driving. So it's nothing new.

It has been deemed appropriate to encourage political entities in areas in which the Federal Government has a vested interest, and it has no more vested interest than what we have in providing for the common defense.

But Berkeley and any other city has the right to rule over its own city as they wish, and they're welcome to do that. But the Federal Government should not reward a city that chooses to obstruct and prevent the obtaining of military members who provide the very freedoms and the umbrella of freedom under which that city acts. They have a right to use freedom of speech, but they have no right to take United States taxpayers' dollars to aid and abet hurting our military readiness.

We took an oath in this body, in this room, to defend this Nation against all enemies, foreign and domestic; and

those who prevent the United States from attaining military members are not the Nation's friends. Though such a city may deserve punishment, all we are trying to do with this bill is just not reward them for hurting our national defense.

Other city leaders, such as those in San Francisco, Toledo, Ohio, like the mayor there, have snubbed or restricted our military. They need to be aware that when they begin to prevent the military from having enough troops to protect us and being militarily ready, they should not expect Federal subsidies to assist them.

It is true that the actions addressed in the Military Freedom Act are mainly actions or omissions by community leaders and not all of their citizens. We understand that. There are good citizens in each of those towns. But the choice of the citizens is either to replace the hurtful leaders or bear the consequences or move. The old adage is democracy ensures the people are governed no better than they deserve. Therefore, those cities either deserve to have better leaders who don't hurt our national defense, or they deserve not to have funds to award their harmful conduct.

Cities like Berkeley should take stock of how many of their very own first responders in the business in their cities of saving lives were trained in the military.

I would remind you also, and I remember vividly because I was about to go on active duty about the time Vietnam was ended, our heroes came back from Vietnam and were spit on. Some of the hippies that did the spitting cut their hair, got into positions in cities and have found, figuratively, new, effective ways of spitting on our military.

But everyone should understand, Mr. Speaker, this is not taking away money for expressing free speech. It's simply not rewarding the obstruction of providing for the common defense. Since it will cost additional money to overcome the obstruction to our military readiness, the Military Freedom Act takes money from the appropriate place to do that.

This is the ultimate PAYGO bill for military readiness and national security.

In any event, I hope and I encourage the leaders, the majority leaders, the Democratic majority leaders of this body to bring this bill to a vote and let the cities know that we don't reward those who prevent our providing for the common defense.

□ 1630

PAY ATTENTION AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the American people mostly don't pay

a whole lot of attention to what goes on here on the floor, and it's probably better, but hopefully they're paying attention now because it's a sad day, and they need to take note.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that what has happened today on this floor has been an abrogation of duty, an abrogation of our duty as representatives of the people, the finest Nation on the face of the Earth. But given what we've done today, we may not be there long.

Mr. Speaker, there are individuals who have as their stated goal the destruction of the West. You can call them what you will, radical jihadists, terrorists. Their threats are real and they are continuing. And this House, under this liberal Democrat leadership, is ignoring their words.

You don't have to take my word for the fact that these threats are real. Benazir Bhutto was assassinated on December 27, allegedly on orders from al Qaeda. And one might say, well, that's 6 weeks ago. Well, just in the past 48 hours we have seen threats from other radical jihadists. In Denmark, three jihadists were arrested in a plot to murder a cartoonist for drawing an editorial cartoon years ago that they found objectionable. Mr. Speaker, I know that some on the majority side view this as comic relief, I guess, but the three jihadists who were arrested to plot the murder of a cartoonist in Denmark within the past 48 hours didn't view it as comedy. And this Democrat majority and leadership says, oh, that's okay, don't worry about it. Mr. Speaker, I hope the American people are paying attention.

In the last 48 hours, in the Philippines, jihadists with two terrorist groups associated with al Qaeda are said to be plotting to assassinate the Filipino President and bomb western embassies. And this Democrat majority leadership says, oh, that's okay, don't worry.

Mr. Speaker, in the last 48 hours in Iraq, the reputed leader of al Qaeda in Iraq posted on a jihadi Web site a call for war with Israel and for jihadists to use Iraq as a launching pad to seize Jerusalem. And this Democrat majority leadership says, oh, that's okay, don't worry about it.

And just this morning, Hezbollah chief Hassan Nasrallah raised the prospect of war with Israel declaring, "Zionists, if you want this kind of open war, let the whole world listen: Let this war be open." And the Democrat majority leadership in this House said, that's okay, don't worry about it.

Mr. Speaker, I am astounded that the House of Representatives will leave town today and go home when Saturday of this week the opportunity and the ability of our intelligence community to protect us and other freedom-loving people around the world will expire. I'm astounded.

Most of what we do on this floor my constituents think doesn't make a whole lot of difference in their lives. Mr. Speaker, this makes a whole lot of

difference in the lives of my constituents, in the lives of your constituents, in the lives of every single American. And not to have acted today on this bill to allow our intelligence community to keep us safe and protect us, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, is an abrogation of duty.

I call on the Democrat leadership and the Speaker of the House to bring us back into session as soon as possible and, on behalf of the American people, act responsibly, live up to your oath, and pass this bill, the Protect America Act.

SUNSET MEMORIAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I stand once again before this body with another sunset memorial.

It is February 14, 2008, Valentine's Day, in the land of the free and the home of the brave. And before the sunset today in America, almost 4,000 more defenseless unborn children were killed by abortion on demand. That's just today, Mr. Speaker. That is more than the number of innocent lives that America lost on September 11, only it happens every day.

It has now been exactly 12,806 days since the tragic judicial fiat of *Roe v. Wade* was handed down. Since then, the very foundation of this Nation has been stained by the blood of almost 50 million of America's own children. Some of them, Mr. Speaker, cried and screamed as they died, but because it was amniotic fluid passing over the vocal cords instead of air, we couldn't hear them.

And all of them had at least four things in common. They were each just little babies who had done nothing wrong to anyone, and each one of them died a nameless and lonely death. And each of their other mothers, whether she realizes it or not, will never quite be the same. And all the gifts that these children might have brought to humanity are now lost forever. Yet, even in the full glare of such tragedy, this generation clings to blindness and invincible ignorance while history repeats itself and our own silent genocide mercilessly annihilates the most helpless of all victims to date, those yet unborn.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps it's more important for those of us in this Chamber to remind ourselves again of why we are really all here. Thomas Jefferson said, "The care of human life and happiness and not its destruction is the chief and only object of good government."

Mr. Speaker, protecting the lives of our innocent citizens and their constitutional rights is why we are all here. It is our sworn oath. The phrase in the 14th amendment capsulizes our entire Constitution. It says, "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law."

The bedrock foundation of this Republic is the declaration, not the casual notion, but the declaration of the self-evident truth that all human beings are created equal and endowed by their creator with the unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. And every conflict our Nation has ever faced can be traced to our commitment to this core self-evident truth. It has made us the beacon of hope for the whole world. It is who we are. And yet, Mr. Speaker, another day has passed, and we in this body have failed again to honor that commitment. We failed our sworn oath and our God-given responsibility as we broke faith with nearly 4,000 more innocent American babies who died without the protection that we should have given them.

But perhaps tonight, Mr. Speaker, maybe just one someone new who has heard this sunset memorial will finally realize that abortion really does kill a baby, that it hurts mothers in ways that we could never express, and that 12,806 days spent killing nearly 50 million children in America is enough, and that this Nation is great enough to find a better way than abortion on demand.

So, Mr. Speaker, may we each remind ourselves that our own days in this sunshine of life are numbered, and that all too soon each of us will walk from these Chambers for the very last time. And if it should be that this Congress is allowed to convene on yet other day to come, may that be the day when we hear, when we finally hear the cries of the unborn. May that be the day when we find the humanity, the courage, and the will to embrace together our human and our constitutional duty to protect the least of these, our tiny American brothers and sisters from this murderous scourge upon our Nation called abortion on demand.

Mr. Speaker, it is February 14, 2008, 12,806 days since *Roe v. Wade* first stained the foundation of this Nation with the blood of its own children. This, on Valentine's Day, in the land of the free and the home of the brave.

HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KAGEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KAGEN. Mr. Speaker, joining me this evening is Congressman ALTMIRE from Pennsylvania.

I think it's only fitting that on this Valentine's Day we begin to have a discussion about health care in America. It's a heartwarming day. It's a day of friendship, a day of conversation between one's loved ones.

When I was sent here by the people of northeast Wisconsin, I was sent here to listen to their concerns. In my previous existence, I was a physician caring for many thousands of people across northeast Wisconsin. And I continue to listen to them while I'm here in the halls

of Congress, and I want to share in the first few minutes of this hour some of their conversations with me.

Tom and Sue Wright from New London, when I asked them what was important to them, 50 million people without health insurance is a disgrace. Tom and Sue are right, but they're not alone. Bob from Green Bay writes, "If taxpayers can't get the same health insurance as Congress, at least get drug costs down so we can afford our pills."

What about from Casco, Russ writes, "I'm 60 years old, and I have a \$5,000 deductible on my health insurance per family member; all of my health expenses out of pocket. We need help desperately." That's Russ in Casco.

In Greenville, it's the same story. This is from Al and Linda. "As we near retirement, we know we can't afford health insurance premiums or drugs on our own. Please help. We're getting towards retirement. We don't have the money."

From De Pere, it's Kathleen. "It's time for all Americans to have the same health care benefits as their Representatives in Washington."

And finally, from Crivitz, Al writes, "Without a job that pays a fair wage, I won't have money to pay for health care, gas, a war, Social Security, or anything else."

My friends, my colleagues, it's time for us to have an open and honest discussion about what's important in America. And if it's not your health, I don't know what it is. Because if you don't have your health, you don't have anything.

I yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE).

Mr. ALTMIRE. And I want to commend Dr. KAGEN for his leadership on this issue. As all of our colleagues know, Dr. KAGEN, right from the very start, has made health care his priority here in Congress using his expertise.

I have a health care background as well, health care policy is my professional background, and the gentleman and I have spoken numerous times about the importance of health care. And I wanted to come down today to talk about the need for health care reform as we are currently discussing, but also just to commend the gentleman for his continued leadership on this at a time when clearly the political system is in uncharted waters, with a Presidential election that is going on around us, divided governments, we have a Congress with the House and the Senate that are having issues with other things going on.

But we continue to see the health care system get worse and worse. And I think the gentleman and I agree on many things, but most importantly on the need to do something about the health care issue right now. It would be very easy to say let's kick the can down the road another year. We'll come back here in March of 2009 and everything will be different and we'll take up health care then. That's great. You know what? When next year comes

along, we are going to take up health care. And there is a variety of differences of opinion on what the approach should be for health care reform, how expansive do you want it to be.

But there are things that we can do now, this year, in this political environment, that are realistic. And that's what the gentleman and I have been discussing. We want to do things this year that would be considered, if not low-hanging fruit, at least issues that we can all agree on or most can agree on that we can pass and set the table for a further discussion next year on health care reform.

□ 1645

We have a country where there is over \$2 trillion that gets spent every single year; 17 percent of our GDP goes to health care. And I don't think in my district there's an issue that I hear about more often than health care reform when I go around and visit my constituents, and the reason is this is an issue that affects everybody. It's not just your wallet. Obviously, a \$5,000 premium, as Dr. KAGEN was describing, something that we can all relate to, the exponential increases in health care costs. Small businesses every day in this country by the thousands have to make decisions on what to do about their health care costs for their employees. Do they shift the cost to an unmanageable level? Do they stop offering health care? But they know they can't afford it and it affects everything that we do.

\$1,500 of the price of your car, if you buy an American-made car, is due to the health insurance costs of the automaker. Your State taxes are higher because of exploding Medicaid costs. Health care is the last remaining item on the table in every labor dispute in the country. That's why those issues come up. And we have a system that in many ways is better than any other system in the world. It's why people from all over the world come here for their transplants and for their high-end, high-tech care. We have medical innovation and technology advances that far surpass anything happening anywhere in the world. That's if you can get in, if you can afford our system.

The problem is when we are compared to other countries as a nation in life expectancy and infant mortality, we're not just in the middle of the pack; we're at the bottom of the pack when compared to other nations. We have tremendous issues. We're talking about 47 to 50 million Americans that lack access to health care. They don't have insurance. There are tens of millions more that live in fear of losing their coverage. They are one accident or illness away from losing everything. So we have major issues to discuss.

Most important, and I know the gentleman is going to deal with this issue at some length tonight, is the fact that if you're an individual or you're a

small business owner and one of your employees gets sick or injured, you get a call from the insurance company, and they say guess what, we have to drop you because you've had this incident. And I think everyone can agree that your individual health status shouldn't be a factor in your health insurance rates.

And something that the gentleman has taken a leadership role on, which I'm going to leave him with because I'm on a limited schedule myself, and I appreciate his giving me the time, is talking about ways that we can incentivize the 47 million Americans and others who have insurance to join large risk pools, community-rated risk pools, whether it be the 180 million people in the country that are privately insured, that would be everybody, or metropolitan statistical areas, regional groups, whatever we can agree on. And I realize that there are differences of opinion on how big the group should be. But we can all agree that your individual health status should not be a factor in setting your individual health rates. It should be a larger pool's health status, which would lower the costs for almost everybody.

So at this point I am going to thank the gentleman for allowing me to say a few words and commend Dr. KAGEN for his work.

Mr. KAGEN. I appreciate your being here tonight, Mr. ALTMIRE. Your contributions to Congress have already been exemplary, and I look forward to working with you in the future on health care issues. And it's not just you and I, it's not just the Members of the class of 2006, a group I call America's hope for a real change and a positive change in the direction of our country, it's not just the people that call us up, not just the people who send us postcards, not just my patients back home; but it's the most trusted person in Washington, DC that understands the importance of health care costs today. And who is that person? That's our Comptroller General, David Walker, who, on January 28 before the Senate Budget Committee, had these words to say: "Under any plausible scenario, the Federal budget is on an imprudent and unsustainable path. Rapidly rising health care costs are not simply a Federal budget problem; they are our Nation's number one fiscal challenge. The growth in health-related spending is the primary driver of the fiscal challenges facing the State and local governments. Unsustainable growth in health care spending is a system-wide challenge that also threatens to erode the ability of employers to provide coverage for their workers and undercuts our ability to compete in a global marketplace."

And he went on to say that the key points in his presentation are: "Although recently declines in our annual budget deficit are good news, our longer-term fiscal outlook is worse, and absent meaningful action, we will

face spiraling levels of debt. Our long-term fiscal challenge is primarily a health care challenge."

Well, I think the Comptroller General has it right. It's our health care challenge. And people every day in Wisconsin and across the country are challenged when they receive in the mail a solicitation from an insurance company, one such as this: with happy smiling faces on the front, they invite you to call an 800 number to see if you qualify. But here's the list, and it reads: "Important information about preexisting conditions. Although we make every effort to extend coverage to all applicants, not everyone will qualify. If you have had treatment for any of the following conditions, you may not qualify for coverage." And it lists a long list of conditions that many millions of people have. And at the very end there is a real teaser, and it says: "This list is not all-inclusive. Other conditions may apply."

My friends and my fellow Americans, I believe it's time on this Valentine's Day, February 14 of 2008, to bring an end to the discriminatory actions that insurance companies now enjoy. We have to bring an end to the discrimination against any citizen in this country based on their preexisting medical conditions.

Before I highlight the bill that I am putting in for submission today called No Discrimination in Health Insurance Act, I'd like to review with you what we have today in our health care system, and it's here to my right.

Our health care system is simply unsustainable. There are three tiers to health care. In tier one, in red and orange, we have Medicaid, which is 61 million Americans; and Medicare, 43 million. These people, in general, don't pay for the bill. They don't feel the economic costs because government is providing for their needs in most cases.

So in tier one, you have a group of people that aren't paying the bill. In tier two you will pay a portion of your bill, and this has to do with the 149 million Americans that have health insurance. But increasingly today, the health insurance premium is skyrocketing, and the cost for care averages \$14,000 each year for a household of four. This price and this cost is beyond what the normal hardworking family in Wisconsin and elsewhere in the country can afford to pay.

In tier three, this is the 47 million American citizens who have no health care coverage at all, and I am one of them as the only Member of Congress who has not signed on for health care benefits. For I didn't come here for a benefit; I came here to guarantee access to affordable care for everyone. But 47 million Americans who choose not to purchase insurance either because they don't have the money in their pocket or they can't afford it. So our system, as it exists today, is unsustainable, unbalanced, and is tipping over rapidly.

That is why I submitted for passage a bill called the No Discrimination in

Health Insurance Act. This bill seeks to do three things: first, it guarantees that if you're a citizen, you're in because no insurance company in group or individual health should be allowed to sell you a policy that excludes you from the community. We have to begin again to ensure communities rather than individuals because what's happening amongst the insurance world today is you will be cherry-picked away from your mate. A husband will qualify but not his wife. A mother may be separated from her family. And what's worse, your neighbor may have a completely different health care coverage only because we're being cherry-picked and divided.

I believe we have to get back to community ratings. It's not just my opinion. Many millions of Americans agree with me. The SEIU agrees with this idea, families USA as well. And our Constitution, in fact, guarantees any citizen and every citizen has protections against discrimination. This is the result of very long and hard-won gains by ordinary people who for decades showed extraordinary courage fighting for positive change and the rule of law to protect each and every citizen. Now I believe is the time to apply this fundamental principle of anti-discrimination to our health care system, because my patients, quite frankly, cannot hold their breath any longer. And that's why I have introduced this bill, the No Discrimination in Health Insurance Act. This essential piece of legislation will guarantee access to affordable care for every citizen in America by bringing an end to the discriminatory practices employed by insurance companies today who deny lifesaving coverage to millions of Americans only because of a preexisting medical condition.

Look, the grim reality is that our Constitution protects us from discrimination unless and until we become sick. I believe our legislation here that I am putting forward will put discrimination where it belongs: in the past.

Ending all forms of discrimination is essential, I believe; but it's also time we pull back the veil of secrecy because today the real price of health insurance, the real price of a pill, the real price of a hospital service is hidden. And that's why the second thing that this bill will do is to show us the price, openly disclose the price, and then allow every citizen to purchase that product, that health insurance policy at that same lowest price within the region. Ending all forms of discrimination is paramount and tantamount to why we are here as a Congress.

If you go to your favorite restaurant, you'll find the solution to our health care crisis right in front of you. They'll hand you a menu, and when you open the menu and see that your ice cream for dessert might cost \$5 for you, what's the price that the person sitting next to you or across the table will pay? \$5. Show us the price, and everyone gets to pay the same price.

If you go today to a pharmacy anywhere in the country and you're standing in line with five people to buy the same prescription drug, you may all pay five different prices for the same product because the price is not openly disclosed and there isn't a free and open medical marketplace.

As a physician for the past 30 years and now as a Congressman for the past 13 months, I understand how difficult it is for families to pay not just their health care bills but their insurance premiums. People today all across the country are choosing between taking their next pill and skipping a meal or vice versa.

But you don't have to be a doctor to know our system is broken because ordinary people cannot afford to pay for their health insurance. These skyrocketing costs are excessive. They're simply out of reach for small businesses. They're out of reach for families across America.

We need to do more. We need to do more now. We need to pass legislation that contains the essential elements of openly disclosing the price, guaranteeing if you're a citizen, you're in and you will not be discriminated against, and that everyone in your region, every citizen or legal resident can pay the lowest price possible.

The reality is our Nation's insurance industry has been successful. It has been successful beyond all measure. And it's been successful by dividing and conquering. Dividing you by your neighbor, dividing up families, and individually insuring people based upon their preexisting condition. We have to put the letters "unity" back into community and restore community-based ratings. We can begin to heal our Nation by doing this, by becoming a community once again.

My No Discrimination in Health Insurance Act requires companies to openly disclose their price, to charge every citizen the same fee for the same service within the region, and allows all citizens to find a benefit by paying the lowest available price. It will end discrimination in health insurance. It's the right thing to do, and it will reduce the cost for everyone across the country for health care. Simply put, if you're a citizen, you're in, without any discrimination against you due to a previous medical condition.

I ask all of you to join me in this effort because it will be a big battle. There are some very strong forces in the insurance industry that don't want to compete for our business. This legislation is essential not just for you and your family; it is essential for small business to survive.

The greatest expense everywhere in Wisconsin, as I went around the district to listen to different employers, whether you're in agriculture and a family farmer or a small businessman trying to run a photography shop, the greatest expense in their overhead is their health care cost. We can and we must do better. And we can do better

by forming an openly disclosed marketplace where people begin to compete once again for each other's business. This is important. It is essential not because I say so, but because the people that I represent say so and, as I mentioned earlier, the Comptroller General agrees.

Everyone in this House, every Member of Congress in the Senate and the House has a health care story to tell. I can share that with you nonconfidentially because they come up to me on the floor and ask me about their health.

□ 1700

They ask me about the pills they are taking. And I am here, I am available, and I can't bill them because, well, I have taken an oath. I only get paid by the people I represent.

The fact is everybody has a health care story to tell. We have to make certain that we don't discriminate against people based on their political affiliation, be they independent, Democrat, or Republican, but by the condition that they are a citizen and they ought to be involved in the risk pool.

Mr. Speaker, I will close my remarks on health care by suggesting very strongly that every Member of Congress consider this. Either you are for discrimination and on the side of the insurance industry or you are against it and you are on the side of the consumer, the patients, and the millions and millions of Americans who need health insurance at prices they can afford to pay.

It was said first in the White House several years ago, either you are with us or you are against us. But this bill allows everybody in the House to decide whose side are you on. Whose side are you on? Are you sitting in the boardroom with the CEOs of the insurance company or are you sitting at home at the kitchen table with mothers and fathers who are struggling to pay their bills every month?

In my State of Wisconsin, and it is true across the United States, the most common reason that people go bankrupt today is they go bankrupt because they cannot afford their health care bills. They cannot afford this. In Shawano County several months ago when I stopped into the county courthouse, I was told that 19 out of 20 families who had come through an education policy after going bankrupt did so only because they couldn't afford their health care bills. We can and we must do better in America. And it starts by reforming our health care system. When we drive down the cost of health care, we are going to cut taxes for everyone. Now this sounds like it is voodoo economics, but if I lower the cost of doing business for every city, every county, every town, every State in the country by lowering health care costs, I can reduce your taxes. This is not just a health care issue. It is a business issue. It is a tax issue.

And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with you some words I was privileged to listen to in a small town in the northern part of Wisconsin, a district I have the honor and privilege of representing. It is a city called Niagara, Wisconsin. And as Niagara goes, so goes our Nation. Niagara is a small town of 1,880 people. And the major employer there is a paper mill, which was recently purchased and then closed. Three hundred twenty jobs in this small town are about to disappear in April. And I went to Niagara to interview some people and listen to their concerns to see what government can do to help them. I spoke with George. George is nearly 80 years old. I would like to share with you his words for our country. They will be available, if not today, then tomorrow at my congressional Web site, Kagan.house.gov, as a video clip.

I asked George, "Are you still working?" And George responded, "Nope, I'm retired 19 years. Put 41-plus years in there. But what I want to say is that Congress should have been aware of this happening because it has been in all the union papers." And he is referring to the closing of the mill, the one major employer in town. "People been talking about it. They put one or two paper machines out of there. They pulled the machines out. And what do they do? They ship the machine to India. That machine was 100 years old, and now it is operating in India. So why was Congress so lax? All these jobs been deteriorating right along."

And I asked him, "How long have you lived here?" He responded, "All my life."

"You were born right here?"

"Yup. I will be 80 years in April. And I have five brothers who worked in the paper mill also, 41, 42, 45, they all worked there that long. And my children during the summer months worked in that mill."

I asked him, "What did you do in the mill?"

"I worked on the paper machines."

"Which one?"

"I worked on them all, all machines. Started off in the old mill, number one, went to number two, and then went to number three, and then to number four"

"And do they have any retirements," I asked him, "at the mill?"

"I have very good benefits, and I am thankful for that. That is what I am worried about now, though. I was told that at the end of 2008, things are going to change. I am going to have to get something else. I don't know that. Nobody told me that. But that is just the rumor. So we have to start looking into something else." He is referring to health care benefits and the prescription pills.

"What makes me mad is that we found out we can get medication in Minnesota and in Canada. And what happens? They tell me I can't do it no more because we would get sued, the company would get sued. They would

save the mill about \$300 every 3 months, and we would save ourselves \$250 every 3 months. And they said, 'No, we can't do it,' so now we have to buy them at Wal-Mart."

And I asked him, "So you think there is a better way of doing things?"

"You better believe it." I asked him then at the end of my conversation if there is anything else he would like Congress to hear? If he were talking then with Congress and with President Bush, what would he have to say, what would you ask him to do.

And George responded, "Get on the ball. Take care of the United States, not foreign countries. They always said foreign countries are going to take us from within. They don't have to fight a war with us. Well, that is what is happening right now. They are buying up all the United States."

George had it right. We have to be able to take care of our own people. I represent people in Wisconsin, not foreign nations. And taking care of people in Wisconsin means, first of all, guarantying them access to health care that they can afford, high-quality care that is delivered right close to home. And how can we do that? How can we afford to continue to pay for those costs when our jobs are being shipped overseas?

So, Mr. Speaker, as a close this evening, I would like everyone to begin to think differently in America. Health care is intimately tied up with our employment opportunities, with our jobs. We need higher wage jobs that will sustain America and provide living wages, a living wage that can afford health care. Health care is intimately involved with our jobs and also with our environment and the education of our children. You can't unwrap all of these problems. They are all stuck together. But the single greatest problem we face today is our health care crisis. And by submitting this bill for passage today, the No Discrimination Health in Insurance Act, I hope to lay the first brick in the new wall for the foundation of the House of Health Care. We have to begin to think differently in America, and hopefully that starts today.

BIPARTISAN EARMARK REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, the need for earmark reform should be an issue that we can all agree upon, a bipartisan agreement. As reported last week, Congress' approval rating fell to just 22 percent. Will the House sit idly by patting each other on the back as this issue continues to grow and be one that the American people care deeply about?

Quite frankly, the effort in the House to bring a level of transparency in the earmark process, as good as it may appear, has yet to satisfy the American

people. As a first step to restoring confidence in the earmark system, Congressman JACK KINGSTON, a member of the Appropriations Committee, ZACK WAMP, a member of the committee, and myself have introduced H. Con. Res. 263, which calls for a joint select committee to review the earmark process, and it places a moratorium on all earmarks while the panel undertakes its work.

Congress holds the power of the purse, and, quite frankly, I don't believe the American people really want us to cede that authority to the executive branch. Under the Constitution, that is the job of the congressional branch. And while I believe that the majority of earmarks are for purposes which help people, those Members who oppose earmarks have made some legitimate claims, and they have to be addressed.

There have been positive earmarks to fight gangs, to fight the violent MS 13 gangs. We created an office of gang intelligence in the FBI to track the gang movement across the country, and there is a growing problem with regard to gangs.

The Iraq Study Group was an earmark, and that helped bring about fresh eyes on the target, if you will, bringing former Secretary of State Jim Baker and former cochairman of the 9/11 Commission, Lee Hamilton, along with Ed Meese, former Attorney General of the Reagan administration whose son is on the staff with General Petraeus over in Iraq, and people like Chuck Robb who is a former marine and Governor and Senator who fought in Vietnam. So it brought together a group of people to take a look at that, and 61 of the 70-some recommendations of the Iraq Study Group have been adopted now, and that basically was an earmark.

I also was told that the work that Dr. Francis Collins has done, and I may be wrong on this, but Dr. Collins has received the gold medal. He is the one who has mapped the human genome system. And there are people alive today because of the work that Dr. Collins has done. Dr. Collins will map those genes whereby we know that some individual with a certain gene may get a certain condition and now they can deal with that to save their life. So there have been some very positive ones.

But I think it is important to acknowledge that the Members who have opposed earmarks have made some legitimate claims, and they deserve that we look at those claims and address those claims.

The joint select committee on earmark reform, which is called for in the bill, would be comprised of 16 members, Mr. Speaker, evenly split between the House and the Senate, because whatever we do, the House and the Senate have to be together, also, between Republicans and Democrats. And I think the American people are thirsty. They are thirsty for some bipartisan activity

out of this Congress. So we will come together, Republicans and Democrats, House and Senate, to form this committee.

The panel would examine the way the earmarks are included in authorizing bills, which has not been done, appropriation bills. And to the credit of the committee, there has been some work done on the appropriations. Also, tax and tariff measures. Also, what has not been done very well, executive branch earmarks would also be studied. I want to stress that again, because I think the Congress has ignored some of this and I think the general public doesn't understand, but this panel would also, Mr. Speaker, look at executive branch earmarks, reviewing earmarks in all bills considered by Congress. All bills is really the key.

The House, during this period of time, should place a moratorium on all earmarks until the joint select committee has finished its work and we are able to put into place a rule system that restores the confidence of Americans that legislation is not loaded up with hidden special interests or wasteful spending. It would restore honesty, integrity, and openness to the process that everyone would feel very confident because the ground rules would have been agreed to by everyone. The American public would see how this was done.

I strongly support the earmark reform, including listing names of sponsors on earmarks or specific line item spending. But the rules, Mr. Speaker, must apply an equal standard to all legislation, appropriations, as well as authorizing and tax bills and disclosing earmark sponsors. It must be across the board in every bill, but it also must be a process of indisputable integrity and probity that is honest and authentic, and one in which the American people have absolute trust. That is the key. It has to be a process, Mr. Speaker, in which the American people have absolute trust.

Earmark reform must be bipartisan. It must be an issue on which both political parties can come together so that every Member of Congress can know what is in there, the American people can know it. And I am hopeful that Members on both sides of the aisle will join this effort and support the Kingston-Wamp-Wolf earmark reform bill.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we have the opportunity after we do that, because I know most Americans are concerned about the spending with regard to the Federal debt and the deficit. I have a bill with Congressman COOPER, again, a bipartisan bill, and again, it is good to see, we have to work across the aisle. It is called the Cooper-Wolf bill, Mr. Speaker, and what it does, it sets up a national commission of eight Republicans and eight Democrats, and I would tell Members that there are 70 Members plus on the bill, roughly 30 Democratic Members and 40 Republican Members. I must say, Congress-

man HOYER gave a very powerful speech at the Press Club several months ago endorsing this concept. On the bill, we have Congressman BOEHNER, the minority leader. We have Congressman BLUNT, the minority whip. We have people on both sides of the aisle of all political viewpoints from every part of the country. And what it does, Mr. Speaker, it puts everything on the table.

□ 1715

It puts Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and tax policy on the table. It has the support of the Heritage Foundation and Brookings. Alice Rivlin, head of the Office of Management and Budget in the Clinton administration, supports it. We have the support of some of the more thoughtful think-tanks, such as Brookings. A lot of different groups. We have had favorable editorials and comments from David Broder from The Washington Post, David Brooks from The New York Times, and Robert Samuelson, who writes a column for The Washington Post. Also we have had editorials in papers like the Tennessean and the Richmond Times Dispatch and papers like that.

What it would basically do, it would have this national commission of eight Republicans and eight Democrats to go around the country having a conversation with the American people. They would listen to the American people. Then they would hold public hearings in every Federal Reserve district in the Nation. So they are required to go everywhere.

Interestingly enough, the Brookings Foundation and Heritage, along with David Walker of the Government Accountability Office, are now doing this in what they call "wake-up tours," where they are going out around the Nation to tell the American people of the danger, the fiscal danger, the financial danger, that awaits this Nation if we do nothing about this spending and the debt and the deficit.

Congressman COOPER knows so much about this. I wish he was with me here today. But I respect his knowledge and understanding and his work on the Budget Committee.

But, Mr. Speaker, David Walker said, and I will insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I have sent it out to some Members of the House, David Walker said there was a tsunami, a financial tsunami off the coast waiting to come in and overcome and overtake this country.

As the father of five children, if our children were on the beach and someone said there was a tsunami off the coast of New Jersey or the North Carolina coast or the Maryland coast, we would as parents want to do everything we can to help our kids. So for our children and for our grandchildren, we have an obligation to deal with this problem.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I think it is also a moral issue. In the Ten Commandments it says: "Thou shall not steal,"

and for one generation to be living off the next generation is in essence stealing.

With all the support that we have, the bipartisan support, again, a lot of good Members on both sides of the aisle, I am hopeful that there can be a way that we can bring this bill up and vote on it in this session.

So with the earmark bill that I spoke about earlier which deals with a fundamental problem that the Congress has to deal with, and with this bill, we can have a renaissance in this Nation, create jobs and make a tremendous difference. So I just hope that we can pass both of these bills in this Congress.

I see my friend from Tennessee, and I will yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP).

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, I thank FRANK WOLF for a distinguished career of public service. We honored the life of Tom Lantos today here in Congress, but FRANK WOLF is the same kind of person as Tom Lantos in terms of always caring about what is right, what is just, human rights anywhere and everywhere in the world that need our attention in the greatest Nation in the history of the world. FRANK WOLF is one of the people here that I look to always for the integrity on decisions that are controversial, that are impassioned. He seems to have a level-headed approach that honors the Constitution, honors what is right.

So here we are again working together. Jack Kingston and FRANK WOLF and I, as long-standing Members of the Appropriations Committee, know that this is a problem. This abuse of earmarks has created clearly the need for sweeping reforms of this process. But I think that we need to do it the right way instead of the wrong way.

One of the things I like about JOHN MCCAIN is that he doesn't pander to people based on whatever might be popular for the moment. The right approach to this particular problem with congressional earmarking in 2008 is to step back and establish a bipartisan, bicameral select committee to overhaul the process in its entirety.

I say that because any kind of a ban that is temporary or only for an individual is not lasting. So if you pledge to say no earmarks, well, for how long and who all is affected, and how about the Senate, how about the House, how about the executive branch, how about everybody else? Because unless it is a systemic change, it is not a permanent change; it is not a real change. It is a political posture. Therefore, we should be careful not to pander on this issue, but truly seek change. I think that is what this does.

This select committee, what is a select committee? Well, Congress has this provision so that that committee can rise above the other committees. It has subpoena power. It has tremendous authority. It is unusual. But it is a committee set up to reform a system like this.

Now, a lot of people don't realize that article I, section 9 of the United States

Constitution clearly says that Congress shall appropriate the money. We need also look at history and realize over the last 40 years there is a continuing separation of powers under way where the executive branch pulls and pulls more and more authority from the legislative branch.

One of the things that this select committee would allow us to do is over a 6-month period of time, with five public hearings, have a national debate about what is the Congress' role, what is the executive branch's role, both under the Constitution and in reality.

Just 2 weeks ago, February 1, the President's budget request came over. Actually, it was February 4. But when it came over, it was full of specific requests for specific programs which are an earmark. They are earmarks. So one of the first things we need to do with this select committee is define what is an earmark, because right now it is not clear as to what is and is not an earmark.

For instance, is it an earmark for a Member of Congress to request an increase in a specific account at the National Institutes of Health? If it is the National Institutes of Health and you believe that it should be increased and you are a Member of the United States Congress, and under article I, section 9 you have the authority to appropriate money, that should not be an earmark. But I have got news for you. A lot of things right now classified as an earmark should not be an earmark. It should be programmatic in nature; it should be looked at in a different way.

So this whole system needs an overhaul, and that select committee can get to that without people claiming turf protection or feeling like you are stepping on their toes, and then they can come back with these recommendations that would have the force of law and truly change this whole process without the legislative branch retreating from its constitutional responsibility or just ceding more and more authority to the executive branch, many times to people at the Office of Management and Budget, OMB, that submits these budget requests, who are neither elected nor educated enough on these issues to actually make these recommendations. That why it is important for elected representatives to do this in a very responsible way. The select committee is exactly that approach, the responsible way to do this.

It is comprehensive in nature. As Representative WOLF said, it doesn't just apply to the Appropriations Committee. It applies to authorization committees, tax and trade and tariff bills, the executive branch requests, the whole gambit of direction of funding of appropriated dollars. And the whole thing needs to be reformed.

I will give you an example. The Bridge to Nowhere request is one of the most egregious earmarks that we can point to, and it did not come through the Appropriations Committee. It was

in fact an authorization bill from the Transportation Committee. That is gas tax dollars that every 5 years the Congress directs to this projects or that projects or this priority or that priority, and in fact that Bridge to Nowhere was an authorization bill. So you can wipe out all the earmarks on appropriations; and if that is allowed to continue, the most egregious abuse we can point to continues.

You need a comprehensive and systemic approach to this, and that is why we have had consensus developing in our conference on the Republican side for basically a timeout, a moratorium: 6 months, no earmarks, hold up the trains, let's stop and do this right. But do it responsibly. Don't just willy-nilly say we are going to do this for political purposes or that for political purposes, or we are going to grandstand or pander. No, we are going to do this the way that people 50 years from now can look back and study the record and say, they put the institution and its congressional prerogatives and responsibilities above the passions of the moment, and they recognized that some people abused it and that needed to be cleaned up and reformed and changed, but they did not give the people down the street at the executive branch more and more authority and violate the separation of powers under the Constitution of the United States.

This is an important principle as we go forward on how to truly have a systemic approach to clean this mess up. But it needs change. Anybody who thinks that this system stands the "smell test" in America is wrong. It needs to change, and we are trying to change it from this place because that is the responsible thing to do. People have abused it.

I would argue that the last election in 2006 was lost by our party in large part because of these abuses of earmarks, on authorization, tax, trade, energy bills and appropriations, and we could use an overhaul, a statutory framework that the House and the Senate would both have to adhere to. The public is demanding it.

So some self-imposed thing is not going to bring about systemic change. Systemic change is what this institution needs, change that will still be here 10 years from now, not just for the next election. This shouldn't be political; it should be bipartisan.

Just this week, one of the leading Democrats here in the House basically called for the same thing. He said we ought to have a moratorium; we ought to have a timeout and we need to overhaul this practice. His name is HENRY WAXMAN. I talked to him today. I don't want to put words in his mouth. But I was encouraged that one of the leading Democrats said the same thing, basically: we need to have a comprehensive reform of this process known as earmarking.

But I believe step one is to define it, what is and what is not an earmark, and then go forward. Things that are

existing by law that have been around for a long period of time should not be an earmark.

Another thing we need to do is separate the ability of people to have a cottage industry through lobbying for earmarks. That, frankly, makes everybody in Washington look bad. It erodes the public trust over a period of time.

There are times where someone advocating for you for a specific cause in this country is necessary, and that is called lobbying. Today lobbying has a bad name. If I was a lobbyist I would want these reforms so that my reputation is not tarnished. Just like we appropriators, WOLF, KINGSTON, WAMP, KIRK, CULBERSON, WELDON, GOODE and others that have helped us with this cause, we don't want our integrity tarnished by the people who abused this prerogative under the Constitution.

They are the ones, just like the local law enforcement guy who takes a bribe, all police officers are not like that, and all Members of Congress are not going to do what these people did. Thankfully, the people that have violated our trust are either under investigation or they are already gone or some of them are in jail. But the system needs to be cleaned up so that they cannot do that again. That is what hasn't happened. Frankly, there are some people in this institution who are kind of arrogant about this, saying that it ought to continue and that there is no reason for reform. But that is not true either.

So we have got to meet in a rational, logical way. That is why the select committee approach is the right approach. I am very, very proud to stand with Representatives WOLF and KINGSTON and others in support of this approach, and we will have a moratorium on earmarks until we make the needed changes to begin to restore the public trust and uphold the honor and the dignity that should be associated with our fulfilling our responsibilities under the Constitution of the United States.

I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman. His comments are very good. I think it really needs to be bipartisan and it needs to be institutionalized, and it needs to be done in such a way that the American people have confidence.

I would yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), also a member of the Appropriations Committee.

□ 1730

Mr. KIRK. I thank the gentleman for yielding and join this group of what we might call apostate appropriators who are leading the reform cause, because I think we all agree that the current system was broken under Republican leaders and broken under Democratic leaders.

I believe that we should not tax the American people more than necessary, that taxpayer monies should be spent wisely, and that Congress should use its power to cut waste to keep taxes

low. Many congressional earmarks are a waste of the taxpayers' money.

I authored the amendment to kill the Bridge to Nowhere. It was a difficult choice, taking on a very powerful Member of Congress who had the ability, in some eyes, to delete all transportation funding for my own district. But I looked at this project, it was an earmark not by the Appropriations Committee but by the Transportation Committee, to build a \$320 million structure slightly shorter than the Golden Gate Bridge, slightly taller than the Brooklyn Bridge, connecting Ketchikan, Alaska, population 8,000, with Gravina Island, population 50. Gravina Island has no paved roads, no restaurants, and no stores. It was clear that this was an extravagant expenditure of money by the United States taxpayers to benefit a very, very few number of Americans.

It was also disturbing about how this project was handled, as so many other low quality earmarks are done: air-dropped without consideration by the House or Senate floors; no potential to amend or kill this project by Senators or Members of Congress; added to a conference report, that is a final bill, at the last minute where everyone is only given one vote, "yes" or "no," on the complete package and not able to reach in and delete funding for a low quality project.

Our battle, after the Kirk Amendment passed, was a long one, but finally the Governor of Alaska relented. And thanks to public outrage, thanks to congressional scrutiny, thanks to concerned Americans around this country, the Bridge to Nowhere will not be built.

But we have seen so many other projects which do not pass even a laugh test among American taxpayers. For example, a new earmark, I understand, for the Berkeley school system would create French gourmet menus for school lunches, clearly something that does not even pass the laugh test here on the House floor among Republicans or Democrats.

Also, we have seen these earmarks for Monuments to Me. I think it is perfectly appropriate when we see a proud public structure funded by the taxpayers to be named after one of our national heroes, to be named after a great American, or just great humanitarian from history, but not for sitting politicians who currently hold public office. I am worried that, for example, throughout West Virginia we have many Senator BYRD centers. It seems like almost a large part of the State is now named after a sitting Member of Congress, who comes with feet of clay, someone who can have great, great attributes and great detriments, and someone who really should be judged by history before we name great public works after them.

Our reforms talk about ending funding for these Monuments to Me. It calls for an increased level of, I think, appropriate humility in what we fund. In

the past, like many of my colleagues, I have requested earmarks because I have been struck by critical needs in my district. But increasingly, in order to get funding for small projects in your district, you are asked to support funding for large projects in other people's districts, for Bridges to Nowhere, for more Monuments to Me, for things that are, quite frankly, not defensible for the public fisc and for the taxpayers' expenditure. I think we have to recognize that some of these earmarks will simply lead directly to higher taxes for the American people and for programs which do not reflect an appropriate decision by the government to remove funding from an individual taxpayer to provide for these projects.

That is why I back this moratorium that we have come forward with and I back the Kingston-Wolf reforms, because I think it is a recognition by members of the Appropriations Committee that the system is broken; that the public's confidence in how this money is spent is not there; that Republicans and Democrats should join together to fix it; that the power of the purse is rightly put by the Constitution in the Congress. But it has to be a power that is respected. It has to be a power in which judgment is leveled and which the burden of proof is against spending the taxpayers' funds so that always we have a feeling towards the bottom line of balancing the budget and making sure the tax burden on the American people is as low as possible.

That is why I thank the gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman from Virginia for having this Special Order and hope that this legislation can pick up bipartisan steam and be adopted by the American people. They get it, but some of the elected representatives of the American people here still don't get it, and their voices need to be heard.

I yield back to my friend from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman. And in closing, unless the gentleman has any other comments, I would say this needs to be bipartisan. It is H. Con. Res. 263. I believe it will pass the House. I think it is inevitable that it will pass the House. We have to come together. I acknowledge there have been some sincere efforts made, and I think we come together and institutionalize this with regard to this select committee.

So I want to thank both Mr. WAMP and Mr. KIRK, and Mr. KINGSTON who could not be here, and the other Members who have put this together and say it needs to be done bipartisan. We have to do it so the American people can say, "Well done. It really makes sense."

I yield back the balance of my time.

GEORGE WASHINGTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COURTNEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the

gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, in 1968, Congress officially moved the Federal holiday acknowledging our first President's birthday to the third Monday in February, so now it is commonly known as President's Day. I rise today to give more specificity to such an ambiguously titled designation and to try to pay appropriate tribute to that first President in our experiment of constitutional self-government.

George Washington was born February 22, 1732, almost 276 years ago. He died on December 14, 1799, at the age of 67, a mere 2 years after choosing not to run for a third term, thereby establishing a precedent now enshrined in our 22nd amendment.

He has been described as America's premier military and civilian leader during the Revolutionary era, and yet, as one historian has recently written, young people in particular do not know much about Washington.

By our time, in the early 21st century, George Washington seems so far removed from us as to be virtually incomprehensible. He seems to come from another place, another time, from another world.

He did not write a literary, political, military, or philosophical treatise that transformed our understanding of philosophy, physics, human affairs, or government. Nonetheless, throughout our history he has been compared to Cincinnatus, that late fifth century Roman figure who spurned his plow for a defense of Rome when so called by the Roman Senate. Why is this so?

The basic facts of Washington's life have been retold on innumerable occasions. Nevertheless, if only because this man is on our quarter, on the dollar bill, and on Mount Rushmore, they bear repeating.

Born in 1732 in Virginia along the Potomac River, he was a fourth-generation American. He was not the first-born son and his family was not in the top tier of the Virginia aristocracy. Probably standing at 6-2 to 6-3, and slightly above 200 pounds, he was a physically imposing man. He once threw a stone over the Natural Bridge in the Shenandoah Valley, which was 215 high, was generally regarded as the finest horseman in Virginia, the rider who led the pack of most fox hunts, and was a graceful dancer.

Washington was an adventurer and a surveyor in the Shenandoah Valley as well as an explorer of the Ohio country, then comprised of western Pennsylvania and parts of present-day Ohio. He became a Virginia militia officer, and was at Fort Mifflin in 1754 for that ignominious surrender to the French. He left the Army 4 years later, married the wealthiest widow in Virginia, Martha Dandridge Custis, in 1759, and inherited the now magnificent Mount Vernon when his brother Lawrence died.

At this estate, he was an ambitious farmer, planter, and businessman, at first specializing in tobacco. During the course of time that he had Mount Vernon under his direction, he systematically quadrupled its size, eventually overseeing five farms and introducing new crop rotation schemes that are even today admired for their direction.

While he never seemed to have very much to say, he wasn't indifferent to the larger world. We are told he subscribed to ten papers at Mount Vernon, and in the 1760s, despite owning 50,000 acres, found himself 12,000 British pounds in debt. From this and other things, he came to believe the extant system of commercial trading with his British counterparts was designed for his and his neighbors' perpetual indebtedness. He became a nonimportation believer and a supporter of colonial efforts at self-sufficiency.

As we know, Washington served in the Virginia House of Burgesses. He spoke out against the Stamp Act of 1765, the Declaratory Act of 1766, and the Coercive or Intolerable Acts of 1774. During the First Continental Congress, Washington was a member of the Virginia delegation. After the clashes at Lexington and Concord, he attended the Second Continental Congress, wearing his old military uniform, and was nominated by John Adams on June 15, 1775, to command the volunteer forces that had amassed in Massachusetts because of the British occupation of Boston. On July 3, 1775, he took command of that Army, then called the Army of the United Colonies.

A couple of years ago, I was privileged to spend a semester at Harvard, and I remember walking through the streets just sort of looking at the people playing soccer and baseball, and I saw a monument that appeared to be not very spectacular. I went over to see what it was all about, and it was a monument to George Washington taking over that Army. Inscribed on the walls thereon are the words that he spoke that day to those troops. And while I do not have them from memory, I recall that he indicated to the men then assembled that they were to be united in this effort to fight for freedom. And as I stood there and looked at those words and tried to drink them in, you could almost sense the power of such a magnificent figure of George Washington talking to those assembled scattered troops from all over. He was, in a very simple sense, a commander who commanded the attention and the loyalty of his men. Of course, the Army of the United Colonies was the next year changed to the Continental Army, sounding quite a bit more professional than it was in reality.

While never known for groundbreaking military tactics or strategic innovations, Washington nevertheless displayed admirable courage; exemplified by his exploits in 1755 at Pittsburgh when, with British General Braddock injured, Washington had at least two horses shot out from under him,

had bullets graze his uniform, only to be unhurt and commended for his bravery in leading the troops and organizing their retreat.

His subsequent leadership during the Revolutionary War was indispensable to the colonies' eventual success, finally achieved 8 long years later in the Treaty of Paris. He never accepted a salary as Commander in Chief of the Continental Army. More importantly, he was a visionary commander, finding such competent and important figures as the 33-year-old Rhode Island Quaker Nathanael Greene and the 25-year-old Boston bookseller Henry Knox.

While he fought a mere total of nine battles of which he only won three, Washington knew he had to keep the colonial forces intact in order to defeat the British and woo the French, a dual task he accomplished by not focusing on captured grounds, a war of posts as they say, but on maneuvering and survival. While highly critical of the untrained and undisciplined colonial forces, as Commander in Chief he wrote annual letters to the State governments and kept Congress knowledgeable of his situation in order to maintain some semblance of trust and harmony.

His surprise military and moral victories at Trenton and Princeton, as well as his steadfastness at Valley Forge the following winter, have gone down in American lore as true measures of commitment, of greatness, of endurance, and leadership. The suffering at Valley Forge was unimaginable. There, he wrote, "To see Men without Cloathes to cover their nakedness, without Blankets to lay on, without Shoes, by which their Marches might be traced by the blood from their feet, and almost as often without Provisions as with; Marching through frost and Snow, and at Christmas taking up their Winter Quarters within a day's March of the enemy, without a House or a Hutt to cover them till they could be built and submitting to it without a murmur, is a mark of patience and obedience which in my opinion can scarcely be parallel'd."

□ 1745

He helped to surround Cornwallis at Yorktown in 1781, effectively ending the military aspect of the war. And after the Treaty of Paris was finalized, he resigned as Commander in Chief of the American forces and surrendered his sword to Congress on December 23, 1783.

Now, his decision to leave for retirement at Mount Vernon and attend the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787 was not one without risk. As James Madison said, Washington would be making a decision to "forsake the honorable retreat to which he had retired and risk the reputation he had so deservedly acquired." He did attend the convention and was elected President. As he later said: "Whensoever I shall be convinced the good of my country requires my reputation to be

put at risk, regard for my own fame will not come in competition with an object of so much magnitude."

At the Constitutional Convention, his presence was a calming and vital force. Probably "the most graphic illustration of the singular status that Washington enjoyed was the decision of the Constitutional Convention to deposit the minutes of its secret deliberations with him for safekeeping." And as James Monroe later told Thomas Jefferson: "Be assured, his influence carried this government."

His universal admiration helped overcome the suspicions of the possibility of monarchy arising out of the new Constitution and its king-resembling, popularly elected executive office, a suspicion of which he was very much apprehensive. Republics were thought to be possible only in small, homogeneous enclaves, not on sprawling, vast continents. A fear of monarchy and the concomitant heavy-handed government rule, either from necessity or the nature of power-hungry man, was widespread.

As our Nation's first President, he instinctively knew he would be setting precedents for future executives to follow as they walked this tightrope between centralization and dispersion of power, between deference and democracy.

He was twice elected President unanimously by the Electoral College. As one of the premier historians of the founding era has written, "The whole thing," that is the creation of the Constitution, "was merely words on paper until implemented by Washington's government. Washington knew how malleable the situation was; he understood that every move he and his administration made would be a precedent that would shape the actuality of the Constitution, and he proceeded with great care. It was Washington, for example, who created the structure of the executive offices," we now call the Cabinet, "and it was he who defined the Senate's role in foreign policy and something of the operational meaning of the words 'advise and consent.'"

As Washington himself said: "We are a young nation and have a character to establish. It behooves us, therefore, to set out right, for first impression will be lasting."

As President, he believed in the rule of law, however unpopular such a belief might be at any given time. When the Whiskey Rebellion, a popular uprising in four counties in western Pennsylvania protesting an excise tax on whiskey, occurred, when it threatened to stop the normal functioning of civil government, Washington firmly stood against the subverting of civil authorities. More importantly, in relation to constitutional government, Washington was a firm adherent to its principles. He believed, in contrast to others of the age who sympathized with frequent revolutions *ex nihilo*, that decisions of a republican people "only be unmade in the same way they had been made."

This preference for ballots over bullets and appeal to republican, constitutional, ballot-driven self-government would be made again by Abraham Lincoln in 1861 and be equally as powerful. Self-government in the new Republic required adherence to the law, that is our Constitution, and the laws under it which articulate the boundaries and dimensions of our communal lives together as citizens.

As he said in his farewell address: "This government, the offspring of our own choice uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and containing within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and support. The very idea of the power and right of people to establish government presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established government."

So this combination of constitutionalism and consent, he believed, is the bedrock of self-government.

In 1775 Washington said: "Make the best of mankind as they are, since we cannot have them as we wish." And as President, he ably navigated the waters between Anglo and French factions and their sympathizers, both overseas and within his own Cabinet.

It was Thomas Jefferson's opinion that Jay's Treaty of 1795, an important agreement which kept the United States out of the Franco-British imperial intrigues, that it passed because of the "one man who outweighs them all in influence over the people," Washington.

Perhaps the words of the author Joseph Ellis sum up this magnificent life most eloquently when he says: "Throughout the first half of the 1790s, the closest approximation to a self-evident truth in American politics was George Washington. A legend in his own time, Americans had been describing Washington as 'the Father of the Country' since 1776, which is to say, before there ever was a country. By the time he assumed the Presidency in 1789, no other candidate was even thinkable, the mythology surrounding Washington's reputation had grown like ivy over a statue, effectively covering the man with an aura of omnipotence, rendering the distinction between his human qualities and his heroic achievements impossible to delineate."

In fact: "Some of the most incredible stories also happened to be true. During General Edward Braddock's ill-fated expedition against the French outside Pittsburgh in 1755, a young Washington had joined with Daniel Boone to rally the survivors, despite having two horses shot out from under him and multiple bullet holes piercing his coat and creasing his pants. At Yorktown in 1781, he had insisted on standing atop a parapet for a full 15 minutes during an artillery attack, bullets and shrapnel flying all about

him, defying aides who tried to pull him down before he had properly surveyed the field of action. When Washington spoke of destiny, people listened."

Finally: "His commanding presence had been the central feature in every major event of the revolutionary era: the linchpin of the Continental Army throughout 8 long years of desperate fighting from 1775 to 1783; the presiding officer at the Constitutional Convention in 1787; the first and only Chief Executive of the fledgling Federal Government since 1789. He was the palpable reality that clothed the revolutionary rhapsodies in flesh and blood, America's one and only indispensable character."

Joseph Ellis's description speaks for itself in relation to the man that we honor this month. Still, it is not only for these facts alone that George Washington has earned our highest esteem. He is also frequently commended in discussions of republican political thought and classical virtue. One historian has recently written that "Washington became a great man and was acclaimed as a classical hero because of the way he conducted himself during times of temptation. It was his moral character that set him off from other men."

Washington's life was immersed in this classical milieu of republicanism, virtue, honor, and deference. Washington loved the classical play "Cato" by Joseph Addison in which virtue, not purely self-aggrandizement, is exemplified and praised. As a young man, he copied for himself a text called "Rules of Civility and Decent Behavior in Company and Conversation," a list of over 100 short instructions on how to conduct oneself in the company of others, in society, and in the cultivation of one's manners and morals. While some may call these pithy exhortations trite or simplistic today, are we really going to ridicule Washington for being concerned with his ethical philosophy, a philosophy in which private and public morality are a seamless whole?

Washington did not have a classical education. He did not attend college. He was always insecure about these facts and tried to make "up for this lack by intensive self-cultivation in liberal enlightened values." This self-cultivation was successful and it helped him lead others throughout his military and civilian endeavors. As one scholar has commented, adulation for Washington's classical virtues cannot simply be dismissed. He writes: "General Greene, a Rhode Islander who became one of his most trusted deputies, told a friend that Washington's very presence spread 'the spirit of conquest throughout the whole army.' Greene hoped that 'we shall be taught to copy his example and to prefer the love of liberty in this time of public danger to all the soft pleasures of domestic life and support ourselves with manly fortitude amidst all the dangers and hardships that attend a state of war.' In

part, these rapturous assessments simply expressed the excitability of men putting their lives on the line for what seemed a hopeless cause. They needed to see greatness, and so they saw it. But the accounts are too specific and too consistent for that to be the only reason. Soon after Washington's appointment as Commander in Chief, that dour critic of men, John Adams, told his wife that the Virginian was destined to become 'one of the most important characters in the world.' Again and again, Washington struck the men of his day as an exemplar of ancient republican ideals, almost as though he had stepped from the pedestal of the ages."

Another historian has written: "Washington's writings are crowded with ringing affirmations of revolutionary ideals" and "Washington's friends and enemies alike testified that he deeply believed what he wrote. Like Cromwell's captain, Washington knew what he fought for, and loved what he knew. He was of one mind about that."

Today, Washington speaks to us across the ages about virtue, education, and religious freedom. In his first inaugural address, Washington stated: "There is no truth more thoroughly established than that there exists in the economy and course of nature an indissoluble union between virtue and happiness; between duty and advantage; between the genuine maxims of an honest and magnanimous policy and the solid rewards of public prosperity." And "that we ought to be no less persuaded that the propitious smiles of heaven can never be expected on a nation that disregards the eternal rules of order and right, which Heaven itself has ordained."

About the importance of seeing education and virtue as one philosophical whole, Washington wrote to his nephew George Steptoe Washington these words: "Should you enter upon the course of studies here marked out, you must consider it as the finishing of your education, and, therefore, as the time is limited, that every hour misspent is lost forever, and that future years cannot compensate for lost days at this period of your life. This reflection must show the necessity of an unremitting application to your studies. To point out the importance of circumspection in your conduct, it may be proper to observe that a good moral character is the first essential in a man, and that the habits contracted at your age are generally indelible, and your conduct here may stamp your character through life. It is therefore highly important that you should endeavor not only to be learned but virtuous."

In relation to religion, he was also convinced, as he declared in his farewell address, religion was an indispensable foundation for both morality and republican government.

□ 1800

As President, he attended the services of a variety of denominations. He

addressed Jews as equal fellow citizens in his famous and articulate letter to the Newport Hebrew congregation in 1790. In it he said, "the citizens of the United States of America, have a right to applaud themselves for having given to mankind examples of an enlarged and liberal policy, a policy worthy of imitation. All possess alike liberty of conscience, and immunities of citizenship. It is now no more that toleration is spoken of, as if it were by the indulgence of one class of people, that another enjoyed the exercise of their inherent natural rights. For happily the government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens, in giving it on all occasions their effectual support. . . . May the children of the Stock of Abraham, who dwell in this land, continue to merit and enjoy the good will of the other inhabitants; while every one shall sit in safety under his own vine and figtree, and there shall be none to make him afraid."

This commitment to freedom of conscience had been previously heard in 1775 when Washington had written, "while we are contending for our own Liberty, we should be very cautious of violating the Rights of Conscience in others, ever considering that God alone is the Judge of the Hearts of Men, and to him only in this Case, they are answerable."

Finally, his Farewell Address, with its encouragement to avoid excessive partisanship, maintain American neutrality, achieve diplomatic independence, in short, to implement "unity at home and independence abroad" still strikes the chords of wisdom and prudence in our ears.

I salute the man in whose tribute a monument without words stands in our capital today. Its height, stature and distinctiveness speak for themselves. He was a unique man who seemed to be immune to both bullets and smallpox. It may or may not be true that Washington "had neither copiousness of ideas nor fluency of words."

Nevertheless, even a sometime harsh critic like Thomas Jefferson had to admit that "the moderation and virtue of a single character . . . probably prevented this revolution from being closed, as most others have been, by a subversion of that liberty it was intended to establish."

Now, Washington did say that "with our fate will the destiny of unborn millions be involved," and as we look to his birth, life, service, and death, we know that he was right, and that should give us pause.

Without Washington's character, his perseverance and achievements, all the important historiographical debates over the founding would be merely parlor games of philosophical intrigue. Unlike events in decades and centuries past, Washington believed in, literally started, and served in the system of

government which would be called self-government. Feudalism; monarchy; primogeniture; artificial hereditary distinctions, sectarian bloodbaths. These were not to be the demarcations of this new Nation. As Washington, in his cautiously optimistic manner said in his 1783 Circular to the States, "the foundation of our empire was not laid in the gloomy age of ignorance and superstition, but at an epoch when the rights of mankind were better understood and more clearly defined than at any former period." These rights were understood and defined on this newly freed and expanding continent, a land of which Washington said, "is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? Let experience solve it. . . . It is well worth a fair and full experiment."

For "Washington, America was a practical experiment in the preservation of liberty and the success of republican government." As he said in his First Inaugural Address on April 30, 1789, "The preservation of the sacred fire of liberty and the destiny of the republican model of government are justly considered, perhaps, as deeply, as finally, staked on the experiment entrusted in the hands of the American people."

In contrast to monarchies, Washington established the republican principle of rotation in office. "Presidents, no matter how indispensable, were inherently disposable."

George Washington was "an extraordinary man who made it possible for ordinary men to rule." In the words of the great Frederick Douglass, the former slave and abolitionist, "I would not, even in words," he said, "do violence to the great events, and thrilling associations, that gloriously cluster around the birth of our national independence." "No people ever entered upon pathways of nations, with higher and grander ideas of justice, liberty and humanity than ourselves."

Madam Speaker, we have George Washington to thank for such beneficence. He made it happen. Now let us live up to that challenge to articulate and legislate the contours of liberty and justice for our collective humanity in these United States.

Happy birthday, President Washington. We honor you and appreciate your service to this, to our great country.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. ESHOO (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today after 2:45 p.m.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HASTINGS of Florida) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HOEKSTRA, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GOHMERT, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. PRICE of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 15, 2008, at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for speaker-authorized official travel during the fourth quarter of 2007 and the first quarter of 2008, pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, HON. JOSEPH R. PITTS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND JAN. 9, 2008

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Joseph R. Pitts	1/2	1/1	United States				³ 9,544.00				9,544.00
	1/2	1/2	Kuwait								
	1/2	1/3	Iraq								
	1/3	1/4	Kuwait		164.00						164.00
	1/5	1/6	Jordan		291.00						291.00
	1/6	1/9	Israel		2,095.00						2,095.00
Committee total					2,550.00		9,544.00				12,094.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Total cost of all commercial flights.

JOSEPH R. PITTS, Chairman, Jan. 29, 2008.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2007

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Kyle Parker	10/2	10/1	United States				7,318.79				7,318.79
Janice Helwig	10/1	10/6	Poland		1,346.95						1,346.95
	10/1	10/1	United States				3,130.96				3,130.96
Mischa Thompson	10/7	12/21	Austria		14,298.00						14,298.00
	10/7	10/13	United States				5,169.52				5,169.52
Janice Helwig	10/7	10/7	Spain		2,156.00						2,156.00
	10/7	10/11	Austria				1,496.39				1,496.39
Hon. Alcee L. Hastings	11/27	11/26	Spain		1,732.30						1,732.30
	11/27	11/30	United States				6,199.76				6,199.76
Lale Mamaux	11/26	11/25	Spain		1,419.00						1,419.00
Winsome Packer	11/26	12/1	United States				7,698.84				7,698.84
	11/26	12/1	Spain		2,115.00						2,115.00
Janice Helwig	11/26	11/25	United States				5,209.76				5,209.76
	11/26	12/1	Spain		2,115.00						2,115.00
Shelly Han	12/10	11/26	Austria				1,496.39				1,496.39
	12/10	12/9	Spain		2,115.00						2,115.00
	12/14	12/13	United States				17,222.33				17,222.33
Alex Johnson	12/10	12/18	Morocco		824.50						824.50
	12/10	12/18	Kyrgyzstan		1,474.00						1,474.00
Hon. Alcee L. Hastings	12/16	12/9	United States				8,637.50				8,637.50
	12/16	12/14	Morocco		1,083.50						1,083.50
Marlene Kaufmann	12/16	12/15	United States				8,785.08				8,785.08
	12/16	12/19	Israel		1,348.00						1,348.00
	12/16	12/15	United States				6,828.28				6,828.28
	12/16	12/20	Israel		1,348.00						1,348.00
Committee total					33,375.25		79,193.60				112,568.85

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

ALCEE L. HASTINGS, Chairman, Jan. 30, 2008.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2007

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Collin C. Peterson	11/18	11/20	Brazil		502.00		(³)				502.00
	11/21	11/21	Argentina		122.00		(³)				122.00
	11/21	11/23	Colombia		198.00		(³)				198.00
	11/23	11/24	Panama		244.00		(³)				244.00
Hon. Randy Neugebauer	11/26	12/1	Brazil		1,474.00		(³)				1,474.00
Hon. John Salazar	11/26	12/1	Brazil		1,474.00		(³)				1,474.00
Hon. Tim Mahoney	11/26	12/1	Brazil		1,474.00		(³)				1,474.00
Hon. Virginia Foxx	11/26	12/1	Brazil		1,474.00		(³)				1,474.00
Hon. Tim Holden	11/26	12/1	Brazil		1,474.00		(³)				1,474.00
Hon. Tim Walberg	11/27	11/28	Ghana		139.00		(³)				139.00
	11/28	11/29	Burundi		136.00		(³)				136.00
	11/29	11/30	Ethiopia		140.00		(³)				140.00
	11/30	12/1	United Arab Emirates		386.00		(³)				386.00
	12/1	12/3	Czech Republic		146.00		(³)				146.00
Committee total					9,383.00						9,383.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

COLLIN C. PETERSON, Chairman, Jan. 31, 2008.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2007

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Bud Cramer	10/4	10/9	Italy		4,091.46		(³)				4,091.46
Hon. Bill Young	10/4	10/9	Italy		4,091.46		(³)				4,091.46
Hon. Kay Granger	10/4	10/9	Italy		4,091.46		(³)				4,091.46
John Shank	10/4	10/9	Italy		4,091.46		(³)				4,091.46
John Blazey	10/4	10/9	Italy		4,091.46		(³)				4,091.46
Hon. Allen Boyd	10/5	10/7	Qatar		458.00		(³)				458.00
	10/7	10/8	Jordan		279.00		(³)				279.00
	10/8	10/9	Germany		223.00		(³)				223.00
Hon. Roger Wicker	10/5	10/7	Qatar		458.00		(³)				458.00
	10/7	10/8	Jordan		279.00		(³)				279.00
	10/8	10/9	Germany		223.00		(³)				223.00
Paul Terry	10/5	10/7	Qatar		458.00		(³)				458.00
	10/7	10/8	Jordan		279.00		(³)				279.00
	10/8	10/9	Germany		223.00		(³)				223.00
Hon. Ciro Rodriguez	10/8	10/9	Mexico		493.00						493.00
Commercial airfare							460.08				460.08
Hon. Ed Pastor	10/8	10/9	Mexico		350.00						350.00
Commercial airfare							378.58				378.58
Hon. Ben Chandler	11/2	11/5	Italy		2,425.00		(³)				2,425.00
Hon. John Murtha	11/21	11/24	Kuwait		1,210.50		(³)				1,210.50
	11/24	11/25	Turkey		357.00		(³)				357.00
	11/25	11/26	Brussels		975.32		(³)				975.32
Hon. David Hobson	11/21	11/24	Kuwait		1,210.50		(³)				1,210.50
	11/24	11/25	Turkey		357.00		(³)				357.00
	11/25	11/26	Brussels		975.32		(³)				975.32
Hon. Norman Dicks	11/21	11/24	Kuwait		1,210.50		(³)				1,210.50
	11/24	11/25	Turkey		357.00		(³)				357.00
	11/25	11/26	Brussels		975.32		(³)				975.32
Hon. Sanford Bishop	11/21	11/24	Kuwait		1,210.50		(³)				1,210.50
	11/24	11/25	Turkey		357.00		(³)				357.00
	11/25	11/26	Brussels		975.32		(³)				975.32
John Blazey	11/21	11/24	Kuwait		1,000.50		(³)				1,000.50
	11/24	11/25	Turkey		357.00		(³)				357.00
	11/25	11/26	Brussels		871.78		(³)				871.78
Sarah Young	11/21	11/24	Kuwait		1,000.50		(³)				1,000.50
	11/24	11/25	Turkey		357.00		(³)				357.00
	11/25	11/26	Brussels		871.78		(³)				871.78
Hon. Steve Israel	11/21	11/22	Bahrain		114.00		(³)				114.00
	11/24	11/25	Kuwait		104.00		(³)				104.00
Commercial airfare							10,916.16				10,916.16
Hon. Rodney Frelinghuysen	11/27	11/28	Belgium		217.00		(³)				217.00
	11/28	11/30	France		356.00		(³)				356.00
	11/30	12/2	Germany		418.00		(³)				418.00
Hon. James Moran	11/24	11/25	Germany		745.00		(³)				745.00
	11/25	11/27	Oman		815.56		(³)				815.56
	11/27	11/29	United Arab Emirates		2,149.45		(³)				2,149.45
	11/29	11/30	Behrain		407.42		(³)				407.42
	11/30	12/1	Germany		380.00		(³)				380.00
Paul Juola	11/24	11/25	Germany		745.00		(³)				745.00
	11/25	11/27	Oman		711.66		(³)				711.66
	11/27	11/29	United Arab Emirates		2,149.95		(³)				2,149.95
	11/29	11/30	Behrain		381.80		(³)				381.80
	11/30	12/1	Germany		380.00		(³)				380.00
Hon. John Carter	11/27	11/28	Greece		1,044.00		(³)				1,044.00
	11/29	11/30	Cyprus		344.00		(³)				344.00
	12/1	12/2	France		962.00		(³)				962.00
Hon. Tim Ryan	11/24	11/26	Italy		292.00		(³)				292.00
	11/26	11/28	Chad		230.00		(³)				230.00
	11/28	11/30	Ethiopia		610.00		(³)				610.00
	11/30	12/1	Kenya		268.00		(³)				268.00
	12/1	12/2	Belgium		167.00		(³)				167.00
John Blazey	11/27	12/1	Germany		1,159.18						1,159.18
	12/1	12/4	Norway		1,299.60						1,299.60
Commercial airfare							9,553.20				9,553.20
Kristi Mallard	11/27	12/1	Germany		1,159.18						1,159.18
	12/1	12/4	Norway		1,299.60						1,299.60
Commercial airfare							9,553.20				9,553.20
Hon. Betty McCollum	11/24	11/30	Jordan		1,638.00						1,638.00
	11/27	11/28	Syria		500.00						500.00
Misc. Embassy Costs									3,390.51		3,390.51
Commercial airfare							7,974.91				7,974.91
Hon. Robert B. Aderholt	11/27	11/27	Mauritania				(³)				
	11/27	11/28	Ghana		139.00		(³)				139.00
	11/28	11/28	Burkina Faso				(³)				
	11/28	11/29	Burindi		136.00		(³)				136.00
	11/29	11/30	Ethiopia		140.00		(³)				140.00
	11/30	12/2	United Arab Emirates		386.00		(³)				386.00
	12/2	12/2	Poland				(³)				
	12/2	12/3	Czech Republic		146.00		(³)				146.00
Hon. Andrew Crenshaw	11/27	11/27	Mauritania				(³)				
	11/27	11/28	Ghana		139.00		(³)				139.00
	11/28	11/28	Burkina Faso				(³)				
	11/28	11/29	Burindi		136.00		(³)				136.00
	11/29	11/30	Ethiopia		140.00		(³)				140.00
	11/30	12/2	United Arab Emirates		386.00		(³)				386.00
	12/2	12/2	Poland				(³)				
	12/2	12/3	Czech Republic		146.00		(³)				146.00
Hon. Adam Schiff	12/14	12/14	Ireland				(³)				
	12/15	12/15	Kuwait				(³)				
	12/15	12/16	Iraq				(³)				
	12/16	12/17	Ireland		278.00		(³)				278.00
Misc. Embassy Costs									205.00		205.00
Committee total					64,455.04		38,836.13		3,595.51		106,886.68

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.⁴ Includes conference fees.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS (SURVEYS AND INVESTIGATIONS STAFF), HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2007

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DAVID M. POMERANTZ.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2007

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Visit to Iraq, Kuwait, September 26–October 1, 2007:											
Paul Arcangeli	9/27	10/1	Kuwait		465.00						465.00
	1/28	9/29	Iraq								
Commercial transportation							9,416.30				9,416.30
Michael Casey	9/27	10/1	Kuwait		465.00						465.00
	1/28	9/29	Iraq								
Commercial transportation							7,938.30				7,938.30
Roy Phillips	9/27	10/1	Kuwait		465.00						465.00
	1/28	9/29	Iraq								
Commercial transportation							9,416.30				9,416.30
Alexander Kugajevsky	9/27	10/1	Kuwait		465.00						465.00
	1/28	9/29	Iraq								
Commercial transportation							9,416.30				9,416.30
Stephanie Sanok	9/27	10/1	Kuwait		465.00						465.00
	1/28	9/29	Iraq								
Commercial transportation							9,416.30				9,416.30
Visit to Italy, Germany, October 4–9, 2007:											
Hon. Solomon Ortiz	10/5	10/8	Germany		1,012.00						1,012.00
	10/8	10/9	Italy		70.00						70.00
Hon. Candice Miller	10/5	10/8	Germany		1,012.00						1,012.00
	10/8	10/9	Italy		70.00						70.00
David Sienicki	10/5	10/8	Germany		1,012.00						1,012.00
	10/8	10/9	Italy		70.00						70.00
Visit to Kuwait, Afghanistan, October 11–16, 2007:											
John Kruse	10/12	10/14	Kuwait		210.00						210.00
	10/14	10/15	Afghanistan		50.00						50.00
	10/15	10/16	Kuwait		105.00						105.00
Commercial transportation							10,455.62				10,455.62
Julie Unmacht	10/12	10/14	Kuwait		210.00						210.00
	10/14	10/15	Afghanistan		50.00						50.00
	10/15	10/16	Kuwait		105.00						105.00
Commercial transportation							8,022.24				8,022.24
Roger Zakheim	10/12	10/14	Kuwait		210.00						210.00
	10/14	10/15	Afghanistan		50.00						50.00
	10/15	10/16	Kuwait		105.00						105.00
Commercial transportation							8,339.84				8,339.84
Eryn Robinson	10/12	10/14	Kuwait		210.00						210.00
	10/14	10/15	Afghanistan		50.00						50.00
	10/15	10/16	Kuwait		105.00						105.00
Commercial transportation							10,878.62				10,878.62
Vickie Plunkett	10/12	10/14	Kuwait		15.33						15.33
	10/14	10/15	Afghanistan								
	10/15	10/16	Kuwait		7.67						7.67
Commercial transportation							10,455.62				10,455.62
Visit to Gernay, Iraq, Kuwait, October 18–22, 2007:											
Hon. David Loebsack	10/19	10/20	Kuwait		105.00						105.00
	10/20	10/21	Iraq								
	10/21	10/22	Germany		298.00						298.00
Hon. Tom Cole	10/19	10/20	Kuwait		105.00						105.00
	10/20	10/21	Iraq								
	10/21	10/22	Germany		298.00						298.00
Robert DeGrasse	10/19	10/20	Kuwait		105.00						105.00
	10/20	10/21	Iraq								
	10/21	10/22	Germany		298.00						298.00
Kari Bingen	10/19	10/20	Kuwait		105.00						105.00
	10/20	10/21	Iraq								
	10/21	10/22	Germany		298.00						298.00
Visit to Iraq, Kuwait, Germany, November 2–6, 2007:											
Hon. Adam Smith	11/3	11/3	Kuwait								
	11/3	11/4	Iraq								
	11/4	11/5	Germany		348.00						348.00
Hon. Mac Thornberry	11/3	11/3	Kuwait								
	11/3	11/4	Iraq								
	11/4	11/5	Germany		348.00						348.00
Hon. Gabrielle Giffords	11/3	11/3	Kuwait								
	11/3	11/4	Iraq								
	11/4	11/5	Germany		134.22						134.22
Hon. Bill Shuster	11/3	11/3	Kuwait								
	11/3	11/4	Iraq								
	11/4	11/5	Germany		348.00						348.00
William Natter	11/3	11/3	Kuwait								
	11/3	11/4	Iraq								
	11/4	11/5	Germany		348.00						348.00
Timothy McClees	11/3	11/3	Kuwait								
	11/3	11/4	Iraq								
	11/4	11/5	Germany		348.00						348.00
Alexander Kugajevsky	11/3	11/3	Kuwait								
	11/3	11/4	Iraq								
	11/4	11/5	Germany		348.00						348.00
Visit to Brazil, Argentina, Colombia, Panama, November 18–24, 2007:											
Hon. Loretta Sanchez	11/18	11/20	Brazil		502.00						502.00
	11/20	11/21	Argentina		352.52						352.52
	11/21	11/23	Colombia		198.00						198.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN
OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2007—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Roscoe Bartlett	11/23	11/24	Panama		254.00						254.00
	11/18	11/20	Brazil		502.00						502.00
	11/20	11/21	Argentina		352.52						352.52
	11/21	11/23	Columbia		198.00						198.00
Debra Wada	11/23	11/24	Panama		254.00						254.00
	11/18	11/20	Brazil		502.00						502.00
	11/20	11/21	Argentina		352.52						352.52
	11/21	11/23	Columbia		198.00						198.00
Visit to Kuwait, Iraq, Bahrain, Afghanistan, Germany, November 18–26, 2007:	11/23	11/24	Panama		254.00						254.00
Hon. Jim Marshall	11/19	11/20	Kuwait		105.00						105.00
	11/20	11/21	Iraq								
	11/21	11/22	Bahrain		114.00						114.00
	11/22	11/23	Persian Gulf-Carrier Embark								
	11/23	11/24	Afghanistan								
	11/24	11/25	Kuwait		105.00						105.00
Commercial transportation							11,987.19				11,987.19
Kevin Coughlin	11/19	11/20	Kuwait		105.00						105.00
	11/20	11/21	Iraq								
	11/21	11/22	Bahrain		114.00						114.00
	11/22	11/23	Persian Gulf-Carrier Embark								
	11/23	11/24	Afghanistan								
	11/24	11/25	Kuwait		105.00						105.00
Commercial transportation							10,930.19				10,930.19
Visit to Kenya, Ethiopia, Chad, Belgium, Italy, November 24–December 2, 2007:											
Hon. Kentrick Meek	11/24	11/26	Italy		292.00						292.00
	11/26	11/28	Chad		230.00						230.00
	11/28	11/30	Ethiopia		610.00						610.00
	11/30	12/1	Kenya		268.00						268.00
Mark Lewis	12/1	12/2	Belgium		167.00						167.00
	11/24	11/26	Italy		292.00						292.00
	11/26	11/28	Chad		230.00						230.00
	11/28	11/30	Ethiopia		610.00						610.00
	11/30	12/1	Kenya		268.00						268.00
	12/1	12/2	Belgium		167.00						167.00
Stephanie Sanok	11/24	11/26	Italy		292.00						292.00
	11/26	11/28	Chad		230.00						230.00
	11/28	11/30	Ethiopia		610.00						610.00
	11/30	12/1	Kenya		268.00						268.00
	12/1	12/2	Belgium		167.00						167.00
Catherine Steadman	11/24	11/26	Italy		292.00						292.00
	11/26	11/28	Chad		230.00						230.00
	11/28	11/30	Ethiopia		610.00						610.00
	11/30	12/1	Kenya		268.00						268.00
	12/1	12/2	Belgium		167.00						167.00
	11/24	11/26	Italy		292.00						292.00
	11/26	11/28	Chad		230.00						230.00
	11/28	11/30	Ethiopia		610.00						610.00
	11/30	12/1	Kenya		268.00						268.00
	12/1	12/2	Belgium		167.00						167.00
Delegation Expenses	11/28	11/29	Ethopia						3,284.22		3,284.22
Visit to India, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Hungary, with CODEL Bennett November 25–December 4, 2007:											
Hon. Joe Wilson	11/27	11/28	India		536.00						536.00
	11/28	11/29	Afghanistan		75.00						75.00
	11/29	11/20	Pakistan								
	11/30	12/3	India		1,608.00						1,608.00
Visit to Germany, France, Belgium, with STAFFDEL Creadon November 26–December 1, 2007:											
Frank Rose	11/27	11/28	Germany		334.00						334.00
	11/28	11/29	Brussels		380.00						380.00
	11/29	12/1	France		962.00						962.00
Commercial transportation							9,577.89				9,577.89
Visit to Mauritania, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Ethiopia, United Arab Emirates, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Poland, the Czech Republic, Ireland, with CODEL Inhofe November 26–December 3, 2007:											
Hon. Mike McIntyre	11/27	11/27	Mauritania								
	11/27	11/28	Ghana		139.00						139.00
	11/28	11/28	Burkina Faso								
	11/28	11/29	Burundi		131.00						131.00
	11/29	11/30	Ethopia		140.00						140.00
	11/30	12/2	United Arab Emirates		386.00						386.00
	12/1	12/1	Afghanistan								
	12/2	12/2	Poland								
	12/2	12/3	Czech Republic		147.00						147.00
Hon. Dan Boren	11/27	11/27	Mauritania								
	11/27	11/28	Ghana		139.00						139.00
	11/28	11/28	Burkina Faso								
	11/28	11/29	Burundi		131.00						131.00
	11/29	11/30	Ethopia		140.00						140.00
	11/30	12/2	United Arab Emirates		386.00						386.00
	12/1	12/1	Afghanistan								
	12/2	12/2	Poland								
	12/2	12/3	Czech Republic		147.00						147.00
Visit to Germany, France, Belgium, England, November 27–December 2, 2007:											
Hon. Neil Abercrombie	11/27	11/28	Belgium		217.00						217.00
	11/28	11/30	France		356.00						356.00
	11/30	12/2	Germany		418.00						418.00
Hon. Susan Davis	11/27	11/28	Belgium		217.00						217.00
	11/28	11/30	France		356.00						356.00
	11/30	12/2	Germany		418.00						418.00
	11/27	11/28	Belgium		217.00						217.00
Douglas Roach	11/28	11/30	France		356.00						356.00
	11/30	12/2	Germany		418.00						418.00
	11/27	11/28	Belgium		217.00						217.00
	11/28	11/30	France		356.00						356.00
Aileen Alexander	11/30	12/2	Germany		418.00						418.00
	11/27	11/28	Belgium		217.00						217.00
	11/28	11/30	France		356.00						356.00
	11/30	12/2	Germany		418.00						418.00
Visit to Greece, Cyprus, France, with CODEL Sires November 27–December 1, 2007:											
Hon. Phil Gingrey	11/27	11/29	Greece		198.00						198.00
	11/29	12/1	Cyprus		788.00						788.00
	12/1	12/2	France		228.00						228.00
Visit to Kuwait, Iraq, Ireland, Germany, December 14–16, 2007:											
Hon. Gene Taylor	12/15	12/15	Kuwait								

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2007—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
William Ebbs	12/15	12/16	Iraq								
	12/16	12/17	Ireland		278.00						278.00
	12/15	12/15	Kuwait								
	12/15	12/16	Iraq								
Joshua Holly	12/16	12/17	Ireland		278.00						278.00
	12/15	12/15	Kuwait								
	12/15	12/16	Iraq								
	12/16	12/17	Ireland		278.00						278.00
Visit to Kuwait, Iraq, Turkey, December 24–30, 2007:											
Hon. Ike Skelton	12/23	12/24	Kuwait		150.00						150.00
	12/24	12/25	Iraq								
	12/25	12/27	Turkey		360.00						360.00
Hon. Gene Taylor	12/23	12/24	Kuwait								
Commercial transportation							3,028.87				3,028.87
Hon. Nancy Boyda	12/23	12/24	Kuwait		155.00						155.00
	12/24	12/25	Iraq								
	12/25	12/27	Turkey		360.00						360.00
Hon. Randy Forbes	12/23	12/24	Kuwait		155.00						155.00
	12/24	12/25	Iraq								
	12/25	12/27	Turkey		360.00						360.00
Erin Conaton	12/23	12/24	Kuwait		155.00						155.00
	12/24	12/25	Iraq								
	12/25	12/27	Turkey		360.00						360.00
Stephanie Sanok	12/23	12/24	Kuwait		155.00						155.00
	12/24	12/25	Iraq								
	12/25	12/27	Turkey		360.00						360.00
Kyle Wilkens	12/23	12/24	Kuwait		155.00						155.00
	12/24	12/25	Iraq								
	12/25	12/27	Turkey		360.00						360.00
Committee total					36,401.78		129,279.58		3,284.22		168,965.58

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

IKE SKELTON, Chairman, Jan. 31, 2008.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON BUDGET, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2007

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Mark Hadley	11/10	11/19	Kenya		1,260.00		9,845.37				11,105.37
Barbara Chow	11/26	11/19	Haiti		705.00		1,736.20				2,441.20
Committee total					1,965.00		11,581.57				13,546.57

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JOHN M. SPRATT, JR., Chairman, Jan. 30, 2008.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2007

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. John R. Kuhl, Jr., CODEL led by Hon. Eliot Engel to Brazil from November 25–December 1, 2007.	11/26	11/28	Rio de Janeiro		1,237.40		(³)		4 691.60		1,929.00
	11/28	11/29	Brasilia		504.60		(³)		4 276.17		780.77
	11/29	11/30	Manaus		419.00		(³)		4 209.06		628.06
	11/30	12/1	Salvador		467.14		(³)		4 223.96		691.10
Hon. Carolyn McCarthy, CODEL led by Hon. Neil Abercrombie to Belgium, France, and Germany from November 27–December 2, 2007.	11/27	11/28	Belgium		217.00		(³)				217.00
	11/28	11/30	France		356.00		(³)				356.00
	11/30	12/2	Germany		418.00		(³)				418.00
Committee total					3,619.14				1,400.79		5,019.93

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.⁴ Hotel expense.

GEORGE MILLER, Chairman, Jan. 31, 2008.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2007

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

ROBERT A. BRADY, Chairman, Jan. 22, 2008.

February 14, 2008

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H989

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2007

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Steve Cohen	10/5	10/7	Qatar		458.00						
	10/7	10/8	Jordan		279.00						
	10/8	10/9	Germany		223.00						960.00
Hon. Ric Keller	10/19	10/20	Kuwait		105.00						
	10/20	10/21	Iraq								
	10/21	10/22	Germany		298.00						403.00
Hon. Louis Gohmert	11/24	11/26	Turkey		702.00						
	11/27	11/29	Iraq		542.00						
	11/29	11/30	Jordan		274.00						
	11/30	12/2	Czech Republic		306.00						
	12/2	12/4	Austria		778.00		10,542.43				13,144.43
Ur Jaddou	11/24	12/2	Jordan & Syria		835.00		7,407.36				8,242.36
David Shahoulian	11/24	12/2	Jordan & Syria		835.00		7,407.36				8,242.36
Hon. Bob Goodlatte	11/27	12/1	England		1,086.00		1,424.00				2,510.00
Committee total					6,721.00		26,781.15				33,502.15

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JOHN CONYERS, JR., Chairman, Jan. 31, 2008.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2007

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Christopher Shays	11/26	11/30	Turkey		843.00		8,656.65				9,499.65
	11/30	12/2	Jordan		174.00						174.00
	12/2	12/3	Iraq				(³)				105.00
R. Nicholas Palarino	12/3	12/4	Kuwait		105.00						105.00
	11/26	11/30	Turkey		843.00		8,656.65				9,499.65
	11/30	12/2	Jordan		174.00						174.00
	12/2	12/3	Iraq				(³)				105.00
	12/3	12/4	Kuwait		105.00						105.00
Hon. Tom Davis	11/24	11/25	Germany		348.00		(³)				348.00
	11/25	11/27	Oman		143.99						143.99
	11/27	11/29	United Arab Emirates		386.00						386.00
	11/29	11/30	Bahrain		164.00						164.00
Hon. Darryl Issa	11/30	12/1	Germany		348.00						348.00
	11/26	11/27	Czech Republic		153.00		(³)				153.00
	11/27	11/28	India		536.00						536.00
	11/28	11/29	Kabul		75.00						75.00
	11/29	11/30	Pakistan		339.00						339.00
	11/30	12/2	India		1,513.00						1,513.00
	12/2	12/3	India								
	12/3	12/4	Hungary		131.00						131.00
Frederick Hill	11/26	11/27	Czech Republic		153.00		(³)				153.00
	11/27	11/28	India		536.00						536.00
	11/28	11/29	Kabul		75.00						75.00
	11/29	11/30	Pakistan		339.00						339.00
	11/30	12/2	India		1,513.00						1,513.00
	12/2	12/3	India								
	12/3	12/4	Hungary		131.00						131.00
Kristina Moore Husar	12/9	12/15	Indonesia		910.00		9,069.70				9,979.70
Aimee Brooke Bennett	12/9	12/15	Indonesia		660.00		9,069.70				9,729.70
Jeffery Baran	12/10	12/14	Indonesia		471.00		6,258.70				6,729.70
Erik Jones	12/6	12/14	Indonesia		410.00		7,785.70				8,195.70
Hon. Michael Turner	12/27	12/28	Germany		212.50		(³)				212.50
	12/28	12/30	India		270.00						270.00
	12/30	1/1	Egypt		266.00						266.00
	1/1	1/4	Israel		519.00						519.00
	1/4	1/5	Germany		212.50						212.50
Michael Heaton	12/27	12/28	Germany		212.50		(³)				212.50
	12/28	12/30	India		270.00						270.00
	12/30	1/1	Egypt		266.00						266.00
	1/1	1/4	Israel		519.00						519.00
	1/4	1/5	Germany		212.50						212.50
Committee total					14,538.99		49,497.10				64,036.09

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

HENRY A. WAXMAN, Chairman, Jan. 30, 2008.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2007

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Jean Fruci	11/11	11/19	Spain		2,019.00		41,854.33				3,873.33
Dan Pearson	11/12	11/18	Spain		1,855.00		41,199.33				3,054.33
Tara Rothschild	11/12	11/17	Spain		1,620.00		45,354.24				6,974.24
Hon. Laura Richardson	11/23	11/24	Germany		170.00						170.00
	11/25	11/27	Oman		386.00		45,760.19				6,146.19
	11/27	11/29	United Arab Emirates		434.00						348.00
Hon. Brian Baird	11/30	12/2	Jordan		275.00		(³)				275.00
James Turner	12/16	12/22	India		970.00		48,358.98				9,328.98
Chris King	12/6	12/16	Indonesia		1,827.00		47,088.70				8,915.70
Bart Forsyth	12/6	12/7	Singapore		254.00		410,172.70				10,426.70
	12/7	12/14	Indonesia		1,274.00						1,274.00
Tara Rothschild	12/8	12/15	Indonesia		1,827.00		47,785.70				9,612.70
Committee total					12,825.00		47,574.17				60,399.17

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.⁴ Commercial airfare.

BART GORDON, Chairman, Jan. 29, 2008.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2007

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Michael Arcuri	11/24	11/28	Italy		292.00						292.00
	11/28	11/29	Ethiopia		12.00		(³)				12.00
Committee total					304.00						304.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

JIM OBERSTAR, Chairman, Jan. 31, 2008.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2007

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Leonard Boswell	10/4	10/9	Europe		1,082.00						³ 1,082.00
Hon. Silvestre Reyes	10/8	10/9	Mexico		300.00						
Commercial airfare							431.08				731.08
Michael Delaney	10/8	10/9	Mexico		300.00						
Commercial airfare							873.58				1,173.58
Hon. Silvestre Reyes	11/28	12/1	Latin America		848.00						
Commercial airfare							8,628.20				9,476.20
Michael Delaney	11/28	12/1	Latin America		848.00						
Commercial airfare							9,863.20				10,711.20
Hon. Mike Thompson	11/25	11/28	Latin America		1,640.12						
	11/28	12/1	Latin America		1,125.00						
Commercial airfare							8,167.20				10,932.32
Linda Cohen	11/25	11/28	Latin America		1,640.12						
	11/28	12/1	Latin America		1,125.00						
Commercial airfare							7,038.70				9,803.82
Diane La Voy	11/25	11/28	Latin America		1,640.12						
	11/28	12/1	Latin America		1,125.00						
Commercial airfare							7,213.70				9,978.82
Sarah Roland	11/25	11/28	Latin America		1,640.12						
	11/28	12/1	Latin America		1,125.00						
Commercial airfare							7,193.70				9,958.82
Hon. Peter Hoekstra	11/26	11/27	Europe		387.00						
	11/28	12/1	Europe		1,146.00						
Commercial airfare							8,282.63				9,815.63
Jim Lewis	11/26	11/27	Europe		387.00						
	11/28	12/1	Europe		1,146.00						
Commercial airfare							6,645.63				8,178.63
Hon. Mike Rogers	11/27	11/30	Middle East		1,569.00						
Commercial airfare							10,287.13				11,856.13
Kathleen Reilly	11/27	11/30	Middle East		1,569.00						
Commercial airfare							11,364.61				12,933.61
Donald Vieira	11/27	11/30	Middle East		1,569.00						
Commercial airfare							11,058.61				12,627.61
Wyndee Parker	11/26	11/29	Europe		402.00						
Commercial airfare							11,395.38				11,797.38
Hon. Bud Cramer	11/27	12/28	Europe		217.00						
	11/28	11/29	Europe		356.00						
	11/30	12/2	Europe		418.00						
Commercial airfare											³ 991.00
Hon. Silvestre Reyes	11/28	11/30	Latin America		1,640.12						
Commercial airfare							8,662.20				10,302.32
Michael Delaney	11/28	11/30	Latin America		1,640.12						
Commercial airfare							9,883.20				11,523.32
Jeremy Bash	11/28	11/30	Latin America		1,640.12						
Commercial airfare							3,879.20				5,519.32
Mark Young	11/25	11/29	Europe		1,736.00						
	11/30	12/1	Europe		868.00						
Commercial airfare											³ 2,604.00
George Pappas	11/25	11/29	Europe		1,736.00						
	11/30	12/1	Europe		868.00						
Commercial airfare											³ 2,604.00
Stacey Dixon	11/26	11/28	Europe		732.00						
	11/28	12/1	Europe		1,704.00						
Commercial airfare							9,224.37				11,660.37
Jody Houck	11/26	11/28	Europe		732.00						
	11/28	12/1	Europe		1,704.00						
Commercial airfare							9,877.37				12,313.37
Josh Kirshner	11/25	11/27	Europe		250.00						
	11/27	11/29	Europe		1,107.00						
	11/29	12/1	Europe		331.61						
Commercial airfare							6,516.49				8,205.10
Mieke Eoyang	11/25	11/27	Europe		250.00						
	11/27	11/29	Europe		1,107.00						
	11/29	12/1	Europe		331.61						
Commercial airfare							6,516.49				8,205.10
Fred Fleitz	11/25	11/27	Europe		250.00						
	11/27	11/29	Europe		1,107.00						
	11/29	12/1	Europe		331.61						
Commercial airfare							6,516.49				8,205.10
Committee total					43,670.67		169,519.16				213,189.83

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

SILVESTRE REYES, Chairman, Jan. 30, 2008.

RULES AND REPORTS SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO THE CONGRES- SIONAL REVIEW ACT

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(d), executive communications [final rules] submitted to the House pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1) during the period of July 27, 2007, through January 3, 2008, shall be treated as though received on February 14, 2008. Original dates of transmittal, numberings, and referrals to committee of those executive communications remain as indicated in the Executive Communication section of the relevant CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5352. A letter from the Senior Vice President for Congressional Affairs, Export-Import Bank, transmitting the Bank's FY 2007 annual report for the Sub-Saharan Africa Initiative; to the Committee on Financial Services.

5353. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting the annual report to Congress on the operations of the Export-Import Bank of the United States for Fiscal Year 2007, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635g; to the Committee on Financial Services.

5354. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Management, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting the Board's information on its 2008 compensation program, including current base salary structures, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1833b; to the Committee on Financial Services.

5355. A letter from the Chairperson, National Council of Disability, transmitting the Council's report entitled, "The No Child Left Behind Act and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act: A Progress Report"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

5356. A letter from the Administrator, Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting a copy of the Energy Information Administration's "Profiles of Foreign Direct Investment in U.S. Energy 2006," pursuant to Public Law 95-91, section 205(h); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5357. A letter from the Director, Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, Department of Energy, transmitting the 2006 Annual Report on the activities and expenditures of the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5358. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's Performance and Accountability Report for Fiscal Year 2007; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5359. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's Fiscal Year 2007 Agency Financial Report; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5360. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's Annual Report for 2007 on the Implementation of the Federal Financial Assistance Management Improvement Act of 1999, pursuant to Public Law 106-107, section 5(d); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5361. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the

Office's annual report for fiscal year 2007, in accordance with Section 203(a) of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5362. A letter from the Secretary of the Board of Governors, U.S. Postal Service, transmitting the Service's Report, as required by Section 3686(c) of the Postal Accountability and Enhancement Act of 2006; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5363. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's report detailing the progress and the status of compliance with privatization requirements, pursuant to Public Law 105-33, section 11201(c) (111 Stat. 734); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5364. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 2008-9, Waiver of Section 1083 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5365. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Visas: Documentation of Nonimmigrants Under the Immigration and Nationality Act — January 25, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5366. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Pottsville, PA. [Docket No. FAA-2005-22490; Airspace Docket No. 05-AEA-018] received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5367. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Philipsburg, PA. [Docket No. FAA-2005-22493; Airspace Docket No. 05-AEA-021] received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5368. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Fort Scott, KS. [Docket No. FAA-2007-28771; Airspace Docket No. 07-ACE-8] received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5369. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Lee's Summit, MO. [Docket No. FAA-2007-28776; Airspace Docket No. 07-ACE-10] received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5370. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; St. Marys, PA. [Docket No. FAA-2005-22492; Airspace Docket No. 05-AEA-020] received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5371. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Tappahannock, VA. [Docket No. FAA-2007-29264; Airspace Docket No. 07-AEA-04] received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5372. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting

the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Muncy, PA. [Docket No. FAA-2007-0023; Airspace Docket No. 07-AEA-08] received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5373. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Hailey, ID [Docket No. FAA-2007-27911; Airspace Docket No. 07-ANM-8] received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5374. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Williamsport, PA. [Docket No. FAA-2005-22491; Airspace Docket No. 05-AEA-019] received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5375. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to Class E Airspace; Du Bois, PA [Docket No. FAA-2005-22489; Airspace Docket No. 05-AEA-017] received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5376. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Aguadilla, PR [Docket No. FAA-2007-29086; Airspace Docket No. 07-ASO-22] received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5377. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30585; Amdt. No. 3249] received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5378. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 777 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-27619; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-164-AD; Amendment 39-15257; AD 2007-23-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5379. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 767-200, -300, and -300F Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-28376; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-108-AD; Amendment 39-15255; AD 2007-23-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5380. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Model 560 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-0190; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-234-AD; Amendment 39-15259; AD 2007-23-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5381. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-400, 747-400D, and 747-400F Series Airplanes; Model 757-200 Series Airplanes; and Model 767-200, 767-300, and 767-300F Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-28380; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-088-AD; Amendment 39-15254; AD 2007-23-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5382. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 707 Airplanes and Model 720 and 720B Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-28828; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-010-AD; Amendment 39-15258; AD 2007-23-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5383. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-0073; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-229-AD; Amendment 39-15240; AD 2007-22-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5384. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; EADS SOCATA Model TBM 700 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-0158; Directorate Identifier 2007-CE-081-AD; Amendment 39-15253; AD 2007-23-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5385. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; CTRM Aviation Sdn. Bhd. (Formerly Eagle Aircraft (Malaysia) Sdn. Bhd.) Model Eagle 150B Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-28957 Directorate Identifier 2007-CE-069-AD; Amendment 39-15252; AD 2007-23-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5386. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Goodrich Evacuation Systems Approved Under Technical Standard Order (TSO) TSO-C69b and Installed on Airbus Model A330-200 and -300 Series Airplanes, Model A340-200 and -300 Series Airplanes, and Model A340-541 and -642 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-28882; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-035-AD; Amendment 39-15247; AD 2007-23-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5387. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330-200, A330-300, A340-200, A340-300, A340-500, and A340-600 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-0076; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-241-AD; Amendment 39-15246; AD 2007-22-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5388. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-0073; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-229-AD; Amendment 39-15240; AD 2007-22-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5389. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-27927; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-182-AD; Amendment 39-15239; AD 2007-22-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64)

received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5390. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 757-200, -200PF, and -200CB Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-27560; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-211-AD; Amendment 39-15198; AD 2007-19-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5391. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300-600 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-28853; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-218-AD; Amendment 39-15241; AD 2007-22-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5392. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F.28 Mark 0070 and 0100 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-28923; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-133-AD; Amendment 39-15242; AD 2007-22-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5393. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. PHMSA-05-21812 (HM-218D)] (RIN: 2137-AE10) received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5394. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30576; Amdt. No. 3241] received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5395. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30578; Amdt. No. 3243] received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5396. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30579; Amdt. No. 3244] received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5397. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc (RR) RB211 Trent 768-60, 772-60, 772B-60, and 772C-60 Turbofan Engines [Docket No. FAA-2007-28976; Directorate Identifier 2007-NE-28-AD; Amendment 39-15244; AD 2007-22-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5398. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc. Model 205A-1, 205B, 212, 412, 412CF, and 412EP Helicopters [Docket No. FAA-2007-27496; Directorate Identifier 2005-SW-37-AD; Amendment 39-15238; AD 2007-22-02] (RIN:

2120-AA64) received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5399. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Model 206A and 206B Series Helicopters [Docket No. FAA-2007-0055; Directorate Identifier 2007-SW-12-AD; Amendment 39-15237; AD 2007-22-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania: H. Res. 989. Resolution dismissing the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the thirteenth Congressional District of Florida (Rept. 110-528). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ROSS (for himself and Mr. NUNES):

H.R. 5437. A bill to promote alternative and renewable fuels, domestic energy production, conservation, and efficiency, to increase American energy independence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Science and Technology, Oversight and Government Reform, Armed Services, Agriculture, Natural Resources, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA:

H.R. 5438. A bill to name the Department of Veterans Affairs medical facility in Tafuna, American Samoa, as the "Fuga Tolani Teleso Satele Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 5439. A bill to establish the Civil Service Reform Commission; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FOSSELLA (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. HOEKSTRA, and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 5440. A bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to establish a procedure for authorizing certain acquisitions of foreign intelligence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 5441. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to extend the special survivor indemnity allowance to survivors of certain members of the Armed Forces who die on active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. EMANUEL, and Mrs. CAPPS):

H.R. 5442. A bill to provide individuals with access to health information of which they are a subject, to ensure personal privacy, security, and confidentiality with respect to health related information in promoting the development of a nationwide interoperable health information infrastructure, to impose criminal and civil penalties for unauthorized use of personal health information, to provide for the strong enforcement of these rights, to protect States' rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and Labor, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself and Mrs. TAUSCHER):

H.R. 5443. A bill to improve defense cooperation between the Republic of Korea and the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLYBURN (for himself, Mr. HONDA, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. WU, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BACA, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. SIREN, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. LEE, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. CORINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WATT, Mr. WYNN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 5444. A bill making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for summer youth employment activities; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 5445. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase Medicare payments for physicians' services through December 31, 2009; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. PENCE, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. WELDON of Florida):

H.R. 5446. A bill to establish a health and education grant program related to autism spectrum disorders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TOWNS (for himself, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. LEE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio):

H.R. 5447. A bill to establish the Social Work Reinvestment Commission to provide independent counsel to Congress on policy issues associated with the recruitment, retention, research, and reinvestment in the profession of social work; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself and Mr. MICHAUD):

H.R. 5448. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the disability compensation evaluation procedure of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for veterans with post-traumatic stress disorder, to improve the diagnosis and treatment of post-traumatic stress disorder by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KAGEN (for himself, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. CASTOR, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 5449. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, Public Health Service Act, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit discrimination in group health coverage and individual health insurance coverage; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. CANTOR):

H.R. 5450. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to remove cell phones from listed property under section 280F; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BORDALLO (for herself, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. GILCREST, Mr. FARR, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. PALLONE, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 5451. A bill to reauthorize the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. FARR, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 5452. A bill to amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 to authorize grants to coastal States to support State efforts to initiate and complete surveys of coastal State waters and Federal waters adjacent to a State's coastal zone to identify potential areas suitable or unsuitable for the exploration, development, and production of renewable energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. FARR,

Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. HINCHEY):

H.R. 5453. A bill to amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 to authorize assistance to coastal states to develop coastal climate change adaptation plans pursuant to approved management programs approved under section 306, to minimize contributions to climate change, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BROWN of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina):

H.R. 5454. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a presumption of service connection of amyotrophic lateral sclerosis for purposes of the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H.R. 5455. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to make nondischargeable debts for personal injuries that result in permanent disability; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 5456. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Tembotrione; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 5457. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Deltamethrin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 5458. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Hydrazine monohydrate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 5459. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Triadimefon; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 5460. A bill to amend the Detainee Treatment Act of 2005 and title 18, United States Code, to include waterboarding in the definition of cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment and in the definition of torture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FATTAH (for himself, Mr. PORTER, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. COOPER, Mr. STARK, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PLATTS, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. TERRY, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 5461. A bill to require the President to call a White House Conference on Children and Youth in 2010; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GOHMERT (for himself, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. SALI, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr.

GOODE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. WAMP, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. HERGER, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. ISSA, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. POE, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HAYES, Mr. LATTA, Mr. PENCE, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California):

H.R. 5462. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to deny Federal funds for any State or city, county, or other political subdivision of a State that prohibits or unduly restricts the establishment or operation of a military recruiting office; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HENSARLING (for himself and Mr. ROYCE):

H.R. 5463. A bill to protect investors by fostering transparency and accountability of attorneys in private securities litigation; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KLEIN of Florida (for himself, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. MEEK of Florida, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 5464. A bill to direct the Attorney General to make an annual grant to the A Child Is Missing Alert and Recovery Center to assist law enforcement agencies in the rapid recovery of missing children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOEBSACK (for himself, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. HOOLEY, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 5465. A bill to require the Department of Defense to implement a pain care initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. STARK, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. FATTAH):

H.R. 5466. A bill to improve outcomes for vulnerable children by investing in families, improving accountability in the child welfare system, and finding safe, stable, and permanent homes for foster children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. BILBRAY):

H.R. 5467. A bill to amend the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note) in order to prevent the loss of billions in taxpayer dollars; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SHUSTER (for himself and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 5468. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide Medicaid coverage of drugs prescribed for certain research study child participants; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. BARROW, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. KENNEDY):

H.R. 5469. A bill to provide grants for the revitalization of waterfront brownfields; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 5470. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require the carriage of all local television signals by satellite carriers in all local markets; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TOWNS (for himself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

H.R. 5471. A bill to require the Consumer Product Safety Commission to prescribe rules requiring distinctive markings on toy and look-alike firearms; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. VISCLOSKEY (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HILL, Mr. PENCE, Mr. ELLSWORTH, and Mr. BUYER):

H.R. 5472. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2650 Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Street, Indianapolis, Indiana, as the "Julia M. Carson Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. WELCH of Vermont:

H.R. 5473. A bill to increase the supply and lower the cost of petroleum by temporarily suspending the acquisition of petroleum for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Alabama (for himself, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BONNER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. CARTER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FARR, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. FILLNER, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. EVERETT, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. CRAMER):

H. Con. Res. 297. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 60th anniversary of the integration of the United States Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H. Con. Res. 298. Concurrent resolution expressing the Sense of Congress on the Humanitarian Crisis in Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. STEARNS):

H. Con. Res. 299. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Cystic Fibrosis Awareness Month; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BOEHNER (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. CANTOR, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. DREIER, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. AKIN, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. FEENEY,

Mr. FORBES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. GOHMEYER, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MACK, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MCKEON, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PENCE, Mr. POE, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H. Res. 986. A resolution recognizing the courage and sacrifice of those members of the United States Armed Forces who were held as prisoners of war during the Vietnam conflict and calling for a full accounting of the 1,729 members of the Armed Forces who remain unaccounted for from the Vietnam conflict; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BAIRD (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. GORDON, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UPTON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, and Mr. WAMP):

H. Res. 987. A resolution encouraging Americans to join others across the country in using their rebate checks to invest in renewable energy and energy-efficient products and services in order to save money, stimulate the economy, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MATHESON (for himself, Mrs. CUBIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. CAPPs, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROSS, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BAIRD, and Ms. HOOLEY):

H. Res. 988. A resolution designating the month of March 2008 as "MRSA Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia):

H. Res. 990. A resolution encouraging the accelerated removal of agricultural subsidies of industrialized countries to alleviate poverty and promote growth, health, and stability in the economies of African countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H. Res. 991. A resolution recognizing the exceptional sacrifice of the 69th Infantry Regiment, known as the Fighting 69th, in support of the Global War on Terror; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio):

H. Res. 992. A resolution honoring the sacrifice of all mothers in the Armed Forces who have deployed to theaters of combat on behalf of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 25: Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia.
 H.R. 78: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
 H.R. 552: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PORTER, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
 H.R. 563: Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia.
 H.R. 657: Mr. MICA.
 H.R. 760: Mr. COSTA.
 H.R. 768: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. AKIN.
 H.R. 769: Mr. AKIN.
 H.R. 882: Mr. PUTNAM and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 917: Mr. MANZULLO.
 H.R. 946: Mr. McDERMOTT.
 H.R. 997: Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia.
 H.R. 1110: Mr. FATTAH.
 H.R. 1174: Mr. KIRK.
 H.R. 1237: Mrs. GILLIBRAND and Mr. LOBIONDO.
 H.R. 1386: Mr. STUPAK and Mr. SESTAK.
 H.R. 1419: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.
 H.R. 1422: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia.
 H.R. 1431: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 1532: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. McNERNEY.
 H.R. 1576: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.
 H.R. 1610: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
 H.R. 1629: Mr. PLATTS and Ms. HOOLEY.
 H.R. 1665: Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia and Mr. PLATTS.
 H.R. 1732: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1742: Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. CHANDLER, and Mr. HINOJOSA.
 H.R. 1767: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. LATOURETTE.
 H.R. 1884: Ms. NORTON and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
 H.R. 2016: Mr. DEFazio and Mr. SARBANES.
 H.R. 2040: Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HERGER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. LINDER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. TERRY, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. RENZI, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. KELLER, Mr. KIRK, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mr. BLUNT.
 H.R. 2169: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
 H.R. 2303: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. LOEBACK, and Mr. STEARNS.
 H.R. 2312: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, and Mr. BOOZMAN.
 H.R. 2325: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 2332: Mr. LATTI and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
 H.R. 2352: Mr. LOEBACK.
 H.R. 2464: Mr. BUYER.
 H.R. 2507: Mr. KUH of New York.
 H.R. 2550: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.
 H.R. 2588: Mr. FOSSELLA and Mr. KUH of New York.
 H.R. 2762: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. WELLER.
 H.R. 2827: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.
 H.R. 2922: Mr. JEFFERSON.
 H.R. 2933: Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia.
 H.R. 2965: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. PASTOR.
 H.R. 2991: Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. CHANDLER.
 H.R. 3010: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
 H.R. 3041: Mr. PLATTS.
 H.R. 3109: Mr. BUYER.
 H.R. 3130: Mr. SKELTON.
 H.R. 3175: Mr. OBERSTAR and Mr. JEFFERSON.
 H.R. 3186: Mr. KUH of New York.
 H.R. 3197: Mr. LOEBACK.
 H.R. 3212: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 3232: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
 H.R. 3234: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.
 H.R. 3257: Mr. TOWNS.
 H.R. 3286: Mr. HALL of Texas.
 H.R. 3289: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
 H.R. 3326: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 3363: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 3366: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. FATTAH.
 H.R. 3423: Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 3438: Mr. HONDA and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 3439: Mr. HILL and Mr. MATHESON.
 H.R. 3494: Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia.
 H.R. 3544: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 3663: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SESTAK, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. PASTOR.
 H.R. 3680: Mr. BURGESS.
 H.R. 3700: Mr. WALBERG.
 H.R. 3749: Mr. SKELTON.
 H.R. 3750: Mr. KNOLLENBERG.
 H.R. 3754: Mr. MATHESON and Mr. HILL.
 H.R. 3817: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN and Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.
 H.R. 3819: Mr. FILNER and Mr. LIPINSKI.
 H.R. 3834: Mr. PASTOR, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RENZI, and Mr. PLATTS.
 H.R. 3861: Mr. PORTER.
 H.R. 3934: Mr. PORTER, Mr. HELLER, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 3954: Mr. McNERNEY.
 H.R. 3975: Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee.
 H.R. 3980: Mr. McDERMOTT.
 H.R. 4008: Mr. HOLDEN.
 H.R. 4071: Mr. LOBIONDO.
 H.R. 4126: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia.
 H.R. 4174: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 4206: Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 4208: Ms. MATSUI and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
 H.R. 4218: Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. McNULTY.
 H.R. 4236: Ms. SOLIS and Mr. HOLDEN.
 H.R. 4251: Mr. COHEN and Ms. DEGETTE.
 H.R. 4266: Mr. GRAVES.
 H.R. 4291: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
 H.R. 4464: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. HAYES, and Mr. UPTON.
 H.R. 4544: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 4652: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 4688: Mr. RENZI.
 H.R. 4790: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 4897: Mr. RUSH, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. GORDON.
 H.R. 4900: Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. RENZI, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. SHULER.
 H.R. 4930: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Mr. GOODE.
 H.R. 4934: Mr. FILNER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. STARK, and Mr. HINOJOSA.
 H.R. 5032: Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. LATTI, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. GINGREY, and Mrs. MYRICK.
 H.R. 5035: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. SERRANO.
 H.R. 5036: Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 5057: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H.R. 5060: Mr. GOODLATTE.
 H.R. 5087: Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. HALL of New York, and Mr. KIND.
 H.R. 5106: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 5110: Mr. HILL, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. COHEN, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, and Mr. DOYLE.
 H.R. 5124: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
 H.R. 5131: Mr. AKIN, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. GOODE, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. SALI, Mr. BILBRAY, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, and Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee.
 H.R. 5143: Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. HILL, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. WYNN, Mr. WATT, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ARCURI, and Mr. MOLLOHAN.
 H.R. 5148: Mr. GALLEGLY and Mr. MCINTYRE.
 H.R. 5161: Mr. LIPINSKI.
 H.R. 5171: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. INSLEE.
 H.R. 5173: Mr. KUH of New York.
 H.R. 5176: Mr. McNULTY.
 H.R. 5180: Mr. WHITFIELD of Kentucky, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MATHESON, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. ALLEN.
 H.R. 5216: Mr. SALAZAR.
 H.R. 5222: Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. SHIMKUS.
 H.R. 5233: Mr. KUH of New York, Mr. CANTOR, and Mrs. MUSGRAVE.
 H.R. 5236: Mr. PEARCE and Mrs. CUBIN.
 H.R. 5242: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
 H.R. 5244: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. CHANDLER.
 H.R. 5265: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. HINOJOSA.
 H.R. 5351: Ms. BERKLEY.
 H.R. 5430: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 5431: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 5432: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 5433: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
 H.J. Res. 67: Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia.
 H. Con. Res. 85: Mr. SESTAK.
 H. Con. Res. 163: Mr. CARNEY, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. WELLER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
 H. Con. Res. 249: Mr. EMANUEL.
 H. Con. Res. 263: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. RADANOVICH, and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.
 H. Con. Res. 286: Mr. BACA, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SRES, Mr. KIND, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HARE, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. ISSA, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. FARR, Mr. REGULA, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. OLVER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. VISCOSKY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. McNERNEY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. SALAZAR, and Mr. BOUCHER.
 H. Con. Res. 290: Mr. MARKEY.
 H. Con. Res. 292: Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. GRAVES, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. AKIN, and Mr. HULSHOF.

H. Con. Res. 295: Mr. WHITFIELD of Kentucky.

H. Res. 111: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H. Res. 248: Mr. BROUN of Georgia and Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.

H. Res. 333: Mr. BOSWELL.

H. Res. 339: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.

H. Res. 356: Mr. ALTMIRE and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 679: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H. Res. 887: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. FOSSELLA, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. SHULER, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, and Mr. ALTMIRE.

H. Res. 924: Ms. SUTTON.

H. Res. 930: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. PASCARELL.

H. Res. 934: Ms. GRANGER.

H. Res. 939: Mr. CARTER and Mr. PORTER.

H. Res. 948: Mr. BOSWELL, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. REYES, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H. Res. 951: Mr. ARCURI, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. KAGEN.

H. Res. 953: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HAYES, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. EVERETT, and Mr. MCHUGH.

H. Res. 962: Mr. WYNN, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H. Res. 977: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. ROSS, and Ms. HIRONO.

H. Res. 978: Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mr. MEEKS of New York.